UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
NORTHERN DIVISION

STUDENTS FOR FAIR ADMISSIONS, *Plaintiff*, v. THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY, *et al.*, *Defendants*.	No. 1:23-cv-2699-RDB

REDACTED
(Exhibits D, E, F, and G
filed under seal)

DECLARATION OF J. MICHAEL CONNOLLY

I, Michael Connolly, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1746, declare the following:

1.   I am over eighteen years of age, have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein, and if called upon to do so, could and would testify competently thereto.

2.   I am an attorney at Consovoy McCarthy PLLC and represent Plaintiff Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. ("SFFA") in the above-styled action.

3.   Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of the July 15, 2024, expert report of Richard D. Kahlenberg.

4.   Attached hereto as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of the July 31, 2024, rebuttal expert report of Brigadier General (Ret.) Christopher S. Walker.

5.   Attached hereto as Exhibit C is a true and correct copy of the July 31, 2024, rebuttal expert report of Dakota L. Wood.

6.   Attached hereto as Exhibit D is a true and correct copy of a document bearing bates number USNA-00021443-45 that was produced by Defendants in this litigation.

7.   Attached hereto as Exhibit E is a true and correct copy of a document bearing bates number USNA-00029187-89 that was produced by Defendants in this litigation.

8.   Attached hereto as Exhibit F is a true and correct copy of a document bearing

bates number USNA-00019473-74 that was produced by Defendants in this litigation.

9.   Attached hereto as Exhibit G is a true and correct copy of a document bearing

bates number USNA-00018355-429 that was produced by Defendants in this litigation.

10.   Attached hereto as Exhibit H is a true and correct copy of excerpts of the

August 13, 2024, deposition of Dakota L. Wood.

*   *   *

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that

the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed on this day, August 28, 2024.

/s/ J. Michael Connolly

J. Michael Connolly
Counsel for Plaintiff

Exhibit A

EXPERT REPORT OF RICHARD D. KAHLENBERG

Students for Fair Admissions v. United States Naval Academy

No. 1:23-cv-02699

United States District Court for the District of Maryland Northern Division

July 15, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.   Professional Qualifications

My name is Richard D. Kahlenberg. I am Director of the American Identity Project at the Progressive Policy Institute, a non-profit, non-partisan research organization founded in 1989. I am also a professorial lecturer at the George Washington University Trachtenberg School of Public Policy and Administration, where I teach on civil rights and economic inequality. The views expressed in this report are solely my own, and this report is submitted on my own behalf and not on behalf of any organization.

I am the author or the editor of 18 books. (For the full list, see my Curriculum Vitae in Appendix A.) Most relevant here, I am the author of *The Remedy: Class, Race, and Affirmative Action* (Basic Books, 1996), which was described by Harvard University's William Julius Wilson in the *New York Times* as "by far the most comprehensive and thoughtful argument thus far for … affirmative action based on class."[1] The book was named one of the best books of the year by the *Washington Post*.[2]

In 2003, *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, a widely read industry magazine on diversity issues, called me "arguably the nation's chief proponent of class-based affirmative action in higher education admissions."[3] In 2013, *The New York Times* identified me as "perhaps the most prominent self-described progressive with doubts about the current version of affirmative action."[4] And in 2016, as they reflected on my time researching and writing about higher education, William G. Bowen, the former president of Princeton University, and

---

[1] William Julius Wilson, "Class Consciousness," *New York Times Book Review*, July 14, 1996.

[2] Norman Ornstein, "Social Issues," *Washington Post Book World*, December 8, 1996.

[3] Ronald Roach, "Class-Based Affirmative Action," *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, June 19, 2003.

[4] David Leonhardt, "The Leading Liberal Against Affirmative Action," *New York Times*, March 9, 2013.

Michael S. McPherson, the former president of Macalester College, wrote that I deserve "more credit than anyone else for arguing vigorously and relentlessly for stronger efforts to address disparities by socioeconomic status."[5] My latest book on affirmative action, *Class Matters: The Fight to Get Beyond Race Preferences, Reduce Inequality, and Build Real Diversity at America's Colleges* will be published by PublicAffairs Books in March 2025.

I am also the editor of four books that address, in part or in whole, race-neutral affirmative action strategies:

- *America's Untapped Resource: Low-Income Students in Higher Education* (Century Foundation, 2004);
- *Rewarding Strivers: Helping Low-Income Students Succeed in College* (Century Foundation, 2010);
- *Affirmative Action for the Rich: Legacy Preferences in College Admissions* (Century Foundation, 2010); and
- *The Future of Affirmative Action: New Paths to Higher Education Diversity after Fisher v. University of Texas* (Century Foundation/Lumina Foundation, 2014).

My law review articles on race-neutral alternatives to racial preferences include:

- "Getting Beyond Racial Preferences: The Class-Based Compromise," 45 *American University Law Review* 721 (February 1996);
- "Class-Based Affirmative Action," 84 *California Law Review* 1037 (July 1996); and
- "Reflections on Richard Sander's Class in American Legal Education," 88 *Denver University Law Review* 719 (September 2011); and
- "New Avenues for Diversity After *Students for Fair Admissions*," 48 *Journal of College and University Law* 283 (December 2023).

I also have researched and published numerous articles on race-neutral alternatives to racial preferences in prominent publications, including *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *The Washington Post*, *The Atlantic*, *The Economist*, and *The New Republic*. (See a list of publications in Appendix A.) Over the years, I have served on numerous conference panels

---

[5] William G. Bowen & Michael S. McPherson, Lesson Plan: An Agenda for Change in American Higher Education 35 (Princeton University Press, 2016).

giving me an opportunity to interact with college admissions officers at a number of selective colleges.

Before coming to Progressive Policy Institute, I served as a nonresident scholar at Georgetown University's McCourt School of Public Policy, a senior fellow at The Century Foundation, a fellow at the Center for National Policy, a visiting associate professor of constitutional law at George Washington University, and a legislative assistant to Senator Charles S. Robb (D-VA). I graduated from Harvard College and Harvard Law School with honors.

I also serve on the advisory board of the Albert Shanker Institute and previously was on the Research Advisory Panel of the National Coalition for School Diversity. In 2013, I was the winner of the William A. Kaplin Award for Excellence in Higher Education Law and Policy Scholarship.

I testified as an expert witness in federal court in the last four years on two occasions: *Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard*, 397 F. Supp. 3d 126 (D. Mass. 2019), *rev'd*, 600 U.S. 181 (2023); and *Students for Fair Admissions v. University of North Carolina*, 567 F. Supp. 3d 580 (M.D.N.C. 2021), *rev'd* 600 U.S. 181 (2023).

II.   Purpose

In 2024, I was retained in this matter by Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. (SFFA) to provide an opinion regarding the availability and feasibility of race-neutral alternatives to the United States Naval Academy (USNA)'s use of race as a factor in undergraduate admissions. In particular, I was asked to examine whether USNA could implement workable race-neutral alternatives that would produce the benefits associated with diversity. The rate for my services in this matter is $500 an hour.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

In making my opinions, I draw first upon my extensive knowledge of the history and study of race-neutral alternatives. *See* Section I, *supra*, and Appendix A. I have also reviewed substantial portions of the voluminous evidence that has been produced by USNA in this case. A full list of the documents and transcripts I reviewed is provided at Appendix B. Finally, I have reviewed and had access to the admissions data, analysis, and conclusions from SFFA's other expert witness, Duke Professor Peter Arcidiacono.

III.   Summary of My Opinions

For many years, the U.S. Supreme Court stated that student body diversity—by race and also by socioeconomic status—offers important educational benefits.[6] As I have testified in previous cases, I also believe there is strong evidence that racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic diversity provide powerful educational benefits.[7]

In its 2023 decision, *Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard*, however, the Supreme Court said that while the goals of educational diversity—such as enhanced cross-racial understanding—were "commendable" and "worthy," they were not sufficiently measurable "for purposes of strict scrutiny."[8] And thus they cannot justify the use of race at public or private universities.[9] In the decision, the Court specifically left open the question of whether military academies, such as USNA, might have "distinct interests."[10]

USNA has contended that it has four interests: (1) to create a diverse academic environment that promotes "an essential exchange of differing experiences"; (2) to prepare

---

[6] *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 306, 330 (2003).

[7] *See e.g.*, Supreme Court Oral Argument Transcript, Students for Fair Admissions v. University of North Carolina, 73 (Ryan Park noting that "SFFA's own expert … conceded and agreed enthusiastically" that diversity "leads to a deeper and richer learning environment" and citing JA 546), https://www.supremecourt.gov/oral_arguments/argument_transcripts/2022/21-707_bb7j.pdf.

[8] *Harvard*, 600 U.S. 181 at 214-15.

[9] *Id.* at 218 ("The programs at issue here do not satisfy that standard.").

[10] *Id.* at 213 n.4.

officers to "lead a multicultural force" that fosters "military cohesion"; (3) to create an environment "where everyone feels they belong"; and (4) to "promot[e] institutional legitimacy."[11] I offer no testimony objecting to these hypotheses or to their legal justifications.[12]

Consistently across various decisions—from *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 306 (2003) to *Fisher v. University of Texas*, 570 U.S. 297 (2013) to *Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard*, 600 U.S. 181 (2023)—the Supreme Court has held that because of the heavy costs associated with using race in governmental decision making, the Fourteenth Amendment "forbids the use even of narrowly drawn racial classifications except as a last resort."[13] The same requirement applies to federal government actions such as those of USNA under the Fifth Amendment.[14] In *Fisher v. University of Texas*, therefore, the Supreme Court held that colleges cannot employ racial preferences unless "no workable race-neutral alternatives would produce the educational benefits of diversity."[15] Indeed, in pursuing the goal of diversity, universities bear "the ultimate burden of demonstrating, before turning to racial classifications, that available workable race-neutral alternatives do not suffice."[16]

With these guideposts in mind, I am prepared to give testimony on three main opinions to a reasonable degree of professional certainty.

---

[11] Latta Declaration (Doc. 46-2) at 34-36.
[12] Latta Declaration at 4.
[13] *City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.*, 488 U.S. 469, 519 (1989) (Kennedy, J., concurring in part and concurring in the judgment).
[14] *See, e.g.*, *Bolling v. Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497 (1954) (reading the Fourteenth Amendment nondiscrimination requirements to apply to the federal government through the 5th Amendment).
[15] 570 U.S. 297, 312 (2013).
[16] *Id.*

First, there is extensive empirical evidence and academic research documenting the myriad (and innovative) ways in which colleges such as USNA can use race-neutral alternatives to produce substantial socioeconomic and racial diversity.

Second, it is apparent from my review of the deposition testimony and relevant evidence produced to date that USNA failed to fully consider *any* of the numerous available race-neutral alternatives that could achieve the educational benefits of diversity about as well as its use of race.[17] These include:

- Providing socioeconomic preferences;

- Increasing admissions of enlisted members;

- Increasing recruitment efforts;

- Modifying and expanding its preparatory programs (the Naval Academy Preparatory School [NAPS] and foundation schools);

- Reducing or eliminating preferences for legacies, athletes in boutique sports, and students attending wealthy high schools;

- Seeking to tweak the Congressional appointments process; and

- Expanding race-neutral alternatives in the program providing the primary source of officers, the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC).

Finally, after reviewing USNA's admissions data and other relevant socioeconomic data, I have concluded that there are race-neutral alternatives available that could produce racial and socioeconomic diversity at USNA without the use of racial preferences.

---

[17] I note that production and depositions are ongoing in this matter and I reserve the right to revise or supplement my opinion in light of evidence produced after this report.

IV.   **Experience and academic research show that colleges and universities can maintain or increase diversity through race-neutral alternatives without sacrificing academic quality.**

A.   **Experience at selective public universities shows that race-neutral strategies can produce racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic diversity.**

For years, supporters of racial preferences argued that no workable alternatives existed for creating racial diversity. In the words of Justice Blackmun in his 1978 *Bakke* concurrence: "I suspect that it would be impossible to arrange an affirmative-action program in a racially neutral way and have it successful. To ask that this be so is to demand the impossible. In order to get beyond racism, we must first take account of race. There is no other way."[18]

Since then, however, numerous universities have proven him wrong. In 2012, researcher Halley Potter and I examined ten leading universities where racial preferences had been banned. We found that seven of the ten—the University of Texas at Austin, Texas A&M, the University of Washington, the University of Florida, the University of Georgia, the University of Nebraska, and the University of Arizona—had used race-neutral alternatives to meet or exceed the racial diversity levels they had obtained in the past using racial preferences.[19] These schools obtained such results through a variety of approaches, including creating plans to encourage geographic and socioeconomic diversity, boosting the transfer of students from community colleges, increasing recruitment, and removing policies such as legacy preferences that work at cross purposes with creating a racially and ethnically diverse class.[20]

Many of these colleges had been adamant that race-neutral alternatives could never succeed. For example, in 1998, the University of Washington was forced to abandon racial

---

[18] *Regents of Univ. of Ca. v. Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265, 407 (1978) (Blackmun, J., concurring).

[19] Richard D. Kahlenberg & Halley Potter, *A Better Affirmative Action: State Universities that Created Alternatives to Racial Preferences* 26-61 (Century Foundation).

[20] *Id.* at 11.

preferences after a ballot initiative was passed banning the practice. At the time, Richard McCormick, the president of the University of Washington, spoke out strongly against the referendum and made dire predictions about its effect on racial diversity. But the University ultimately crafted new approaches to achieve diversity, including recruiting at predominantly minority high schools, expanding financial aid, and considering such factors as "personal adversity" and "economic disadvantage" in its admissions decisions. By 2004, "the racial and ethnic diversity of the UW's first-year class had returned to its pre-1999 levels," when race was still considered in admissions, and the new admissions policy also increased economic diversity among the student body.[21]

Similarly, in 2000, the University of Georgia adopted a number of race-neutral strategies after a federal court struck down the university's use of race in admissions.[22] In particular, the university began using a number of socioeconomic factors in its admissions process, including parental education and high school environment, began admitting the valedictorian and salutatorian from every high school class, and stopped giving preference to children of alumni. Although alumni opposed the end of legacy admissions, the university "has not encountered noticeable fundraising challenges as a result of the change."[23] Although minority enrollment initially dropped after the ban on using race in admission, it has since moved upward and "the years since 2000 have shown the university moving in the right

---

[21] Richard L. McCormick, "*Converging Perils to College Access for Racial Minorities: Examples of Responses that Work from Washington State and New Jersey,*" in *The Future of Affirmative Action: New Paths to Higher Education Diversity after* Fisher v. University of Texas, ed. 118 Richard D. Kahlenberg (New York: Century Foundation/Lumina Foundation, 2014).

[22] *See Johnson v. Board of Regents*, 106 F. Supp. 2d 1362 (S.D. Ga. 2000).

[23] Nancy G. McDuff & Halley Potter, "Ensuring Diversity Under Race-Neutral Admissions at the University of Georgia," in *The Future of Affirmative Action*, *supra*, p. 126.

direction, toward increased racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, linguistic, and geographic diversity on campus."[24]

In 2012, the other three universities examined—the University of Michigan, UCLA, and the University of California at Berkeley—had not reached their prior levels of racial diversity. But over time, they mostly did.

In 2021, UCLA said it admitted the highest proportion of underrepresented minority students "in over 30 years." UCLA's Hispanic population had long exceeded its representation before the ban on racial preferences, and while UCLA's Black freshman enrollment dropped from 264 in 1995 to 144 in 1998, it had rebounded to more than 250 by 2014. Black representation continued to improve over time. Without employing racial preferences, UCLA in 2019 had a 6.0% Black student representation in a state with high school population that was about 5% Black. UCLA's Black share subsequently climbed to 7% in 2022, and the university "ended up more racially diverse than it had been when affirmative action was allowed."[25]

---

[24] *Id.* at 123.

[25] *See ABC Eyewitness News, UCLA 2021 freshman class is most diverse, academically accomplished in history, school says*, (July 19, 2021.), https://abc7.com/ucla-admission-freshman-class-2021-admissions/10897823/; *accord* T. Watanabe, "UC Admits Largest, Most Diverse Class Ever, But It Was Harder To Get Accepted," *Los Angeles Times*, July 20, 2021, p. A1; Kahlenberg "Reply Report, *SFFA v. UNC*," 8; Nick Anderson, "UC-Berkeley can't use race in admissions. Is it a model for the country?" *Washington Post*, November 27, 2022 https://www.washingtonpost.com/education/2022/11/27/uc-berkeley-admissions-race-diversity/ (5% Black High school population); University of California, "Undergraduate Admissions Summary," March 6, 2023, https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/about-us/information-center/admissions-residency-and-ethnicity; and Liam Knox, "A Political Standoff Over Affirmative Action," *Inside Higher Ed*, September 2i9, 2023 (citing UCLA Chancellor Gene Block); University of California, "Undergraduate Admissions Summary"; California Department of Education, "Fingertip Facts on Education in California," https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/ceffingertipfacts.asp.

UC Berkeley, likewise, said in 2020 that it admitted "the most ethnically diverse freshman admitted class in more than 30 years." The one percentage point gap between Berkeley's share of Black students (4%) and the statewide 5% Black high school population was much smaller than the University of North Carolina's gap, where, using racial preferences, Chapel Hill had an 8% Black population in a state that was 22% Black. And UC Berkeley's white freshman population was just 31% in the Fall of 2022, compared to 52% for Asian Americans.[26]

At the graduate level, UC Davis Medical School—the subject of the original *Bakke* lawsuit—also showed that race-neutral alternatives could be viable. Davis created a race-neutral "adversity scale" based on a variety of socioeconomic factors that was lauded as a national model. Although the school was highly selective—accepting just 2 percent of applicants—84 percent came from disadvantaged backgrounds, 42% were first-generation college graduates, and the entering class was 14% Black and 30% Hispanic, both of which were higher than the national average for medical schools.[27]

Finally, the University of Michigan admissions office said its 2021 incoming class was "among the university's most racially and ethnically diverse classes, with 37% of first-year students identifying as persons of color." While Black representation had declined, the overall

---

[26] Janet Gilmore, "UC Berkeley's push for more diversity shows in its newly admitted class," *Berkeley News*, July 16, 2020, https://news.berkeley.edu/2020/07/16/uc-berkeleys-push-for-more-diversity-shows-in-its-newly-admitted-class/; Scott Jaschik, "Affirmative Action Fight Shifts to UNC," *Inside Higher Ed*, January 21, 2019, https://www.insidehighered.com/admissions/article/2019/01/22/legal-fight-over-affirmative-action-shifts-unc-chapel-hill; and U.C. Berkeley, "UC Berkeley Fall Enrollment Data for New Undergraduates," https://opa.berkeley.edu/uc-berkeley-fall-enrollment-data-new-undergraduates.

[27] Stefanie Saul, "With End of Affirmative Action, a Push for a New Tool: Adversity Scores," *New York Times*, July 2, 2023, https://www.nytimes.com/2023/07/02/us/affirmative-action-university-of-california-davis.html.

underrepresented minority population had actually increased from 12.9% (before the ban on racial preferences) to 13.5% in 2021. Meanwhile, at the University of Michigan Law School, the class starting in the fall of 2022 had "a record-setting 42 percent people of color." Black students constituted 10.4% of the entering class and Hispanic students 11.3%—shares that were both *higher* than when racial preferences were employed.[28]

When one digs deeper, the California and Michigan stories are even more encouraging than at first glance. To begin with, their racial diversity numbers provided a floor, not a ceiling, because they could have done more to boost diversity if they had chosen to do so. Unlike state universities in Texas and Florida, Michigan had no percentage plan to admit top high-school students. And unlike Texas A&M or the University of Georgia, Michigan hadn't eliminated legacy preferences. Michigan also provided substantial "merit" aid to wealthy students, thereby diverting funds from need-based aid. As a result, Michigan had only about half as many students eligible for federal Pell grants as UT Austin. Indeed, Raj Chetty's data found students

---

[28] *See* Samuel Dodge, "Largest Ever Student Body at University of Michigan This Fall, Officials Say," *MLive.com* (Oct. 22, 2021), https://www.mlive.com/news/ann-arbor/2021/10/largest-ever-student-body-at-university-of-michigan-this-fall-officials-say.html#:~:text=ANN%20ARBOR%2C%20MI%20%2D%20More%20than,'%20history%2C%20officials%20said%20Thursday; "Brief for the University of Michigan," 21-22; Sharon Morioka, "Meet Michigan Law's Class of 2025," University of Michigan Law School, September 7, 2022, https://michigan.law.umich.edu/news/meet-michigan-laws-class-2025; Linda Greenhouse, "Court To Revisit Colleges' Efforts to Gain Diversity," *New York Times*, December 3, 2002 (noting Michigan Law, using racial preferences, had a student body that was 6.7% Black and 4.4% Hispanic), https://www.nytimes.com/2002/12/03/us/court-to-revisit-colleges-efforts-to-gain-diversity.html; *see also* "Brief of Amici Curiae Oklahoma and 18 Other States in Support of Petitioner, *SFFA v. Harvard*," May 9, 2022, 15 (noting total underrepresented student population increased from 14.5% the entering class of 2000 to 2% in the law school's class of 2024), https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/20/20-1199/222849/20220509155246082_OkSFA%20Merits%20Amicus%20MAIN%20May%209%202022%20E%20File.pdf.

at Michigan came from families with the *highest* median income of any of its 27 peer institutions and that wealthy students outnumbered poor ones by 18 to one.[29]

Although UC Berkeley and UCLA did a better job than Michigan in pursuing race-neutral strategies, they, too, could have done more. Most notably, they employed family income and education—but not wealth—as a measure of socioeconomic disadvantage. Because wealth alongside income would better capture economic disadvantage compared to income alone, these institutions could have achieved greater racial diversity. (See further discussion of the use of wealth below.)[30]

Moreover, while critics correctly pointed out that Berkeley and Michigan had a lower share of Black students using race-neutral strategies than they had before the ban on racial preferences was enacted in the mid-1990s, the comparison was an unfair one. For one thing, in Berkeley's case, the Black population in California declined over time (from 7.7% in 1980 to 5.5% in 2018). Moreover, in 2010, the U.S. Department of Education changed its methodology for categorizing students by race and ethnicity, requiring colleges to report separately students who were members of two or more races. That change had important implications for tracking racial numbers over time. A *Chronicle of Higher Education* article noted,

---

[29] See Richard D. Kahlenberg, "A Fresh Chance to Rein in Racial Preferences," *Wall Street Journal*, October 13, 2013, https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052702304520704579125003614256882; and "Economic diversity and student outcomes at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor," *New York Times*, January 18, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/projects/college-mobility/university-of-michigan-ann-arbor. Michigan did not end legacy preferences until after December 2022. *See* James Murphy, "The Future of Fair Admissions Issue Brief 4: Legacy Admissions Update," Ed Reform Now, December 2023, 10. Table 2, "Prominent Colleges and Universities that Ended Legacy Admissions since December 2022," https://edreformnow.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/The-Future-of-Fair-Admissions-Brief-4-FINAL-1.pdf.

[30] Richard Sander, "The Use of Socioeconomic Affirmative Action at the University of California," in *The Future of Affirmative Action*, 101 (that U.C. campuses look at parental education and income).

"a drop in the number of black students reported at a university from 2009 to 2010 doesn't *necessarily* mean that there were actually fewer black students." In fact, when the new "mark one or more" races methodology was proposed, civil rights groups raised concerns that it would result in an artificial decline in Black and Hispanic representation in government statistics.[31]

Consider the case of the University of Virginia (UVA), which was not subject to a voter-imposed ban on racial preferences and continued to use race as a factor in admissions. In 2008, before students could use the multi-race category, UVA enrolled 1,199 African-American students. By 2012, after the change in categories was put in place, the number of African Americans was 946, suggesting a dramatic 21.1 percent drop. But when the 2012 data included the 206 students who identified as African American and some other ethnicity (for a grand total of 1,152 African Americans under the old methodology), the drop was 3.9 percent. In other words, about 80 percent of the apparent decline in Black enrollment at UVA was due to reporting changes.[32]

In addition, it is important to remember that selective universities in states where racial preferences were barred had been fighting for talented underrepresented minority students with one hand tied behind their backs. UC Berkeley, for example, could not employ racial preferences but most of its 12 peer institutions could. Given the tilted playing field it was

---

[31] *See* Lauren Hepler, "The hidden toll of California's Black exodus," *CalMatters,* July 15, 2020 https://calmatters.org/projects/california-black-population-exodus/;   Jonah   Newman, "What Does the Education Dept. Know About Race?" *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 28, 2014; and Kim M. Williams, *Mark One or More: Civil Rights in Multicultural America* (University of Michigan Press, 2008).

[32] McGregor McCance, "Analysis of U.Va.'s Incoming Class Shows Consistent Quality with Dynamic Change," *UVA Today*, May 16, 2013.

remarkable that UC Berkeley—along with Michigan and UCLA—had achieved as much racial diversity as they did.

Finally, in telling the full story about diversity at universities employing race-neutral strategies, it is important to recognize that socioeconomic diversity typically increased at selective colleges that employed race-neutral strategies. This phenomenon was especially evident at the UC schools, where, in response to the ban on racial preferences, UCLA and UC Berkeley abandoned legacy preferences and increased the admissions boost provided to economically disadvantaged students of all races. With this admissions system, UC Berkeley and UCLA consistently had the highest percentage of students who receive federal Pell Grant among the top 25 national universities as ranked by *U.S. News & World Report*—double the level at many other top-25 institutions.[33]

---

[33] *See* Antonovics and Backes, "The Effect of Banning Affirmative Action," 306 (on the increased weight accorded to socioeconomic disadvantage after California banned racial preferences); and "Economic Diversity Among the Top 25 National Universities," *U.S. News and World Report*, https://www.usnews.com/best-colleges/rankings/national-universities/economic-diversity-among-top-ranked-schools (showing that using fall of 2022 data, UCLA was #1, with 28% Pell, and UC Berkeley #2 with 27% Pell. At the other extreme among the top 25, Georgetown had 11% Pell and Duke 12%.)

B.   Experience at the U.S. Coast Guard shows that race-neutral alternatives can be workable at selective military academies.

The Coast Guard Academy provides further evidence that race-neutral alternatives can be effective. Until the fall of 2010 (which included admission to the class of 2014), the Coast Guard was prohibited by statute from using race in admissions.[34] And yet it took substantial steps to employ race-neutral tools, a fact the U.S. Solicitor general pointed to in the early 2000s.[35] The Coast Guard Academy was able to boost diversity over time despite the selectivity of its campus. (In the class of 2014, only 18% of applicants were admitted.)[36]

The progress over time was considerable. In the class of 2009, only 24 of 225 students (10.7%) were members of racial minority groups.[37] By the class of 2013, that share had risen to 44 of 288 students (15.3%). That share grew to 24% in the class of 2014, which was admitted under race-neutral standards.[38]

How did the Coast Guard significantly increase diversity over a short period of time without racial preferences? Significantly, the Coast Guard Academy doubled its recruitment budget. It advertised in outlets such as Black Entertainment Television, and hosted minority applicants on campus.[39] The Coast Guard Academy created new relationships with predominantly Black institutions. It also increased its admissions of enlisted members (who

---

[34] Jennifer McDermott, "Ethnicity, gender now factor in CGA admissions," The Day of New London, January 22, 2011.

[35] *Grutter v. Bollinger*, Supreme Court Oral Argument Transcript 19-22, available at https://www.supremecourt.gov/oral_arguments/argument_transcripts/2002/02-241.pdf.

[36] McDermott, "Ethnicity, gender now factor in CGA admissions" (noting only 400 students were accepted of 2,200 who applied).

[37] Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, June 19, 2009, https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CHRG-111hhrg50631/html/CHRG-111hhrg50631.htm

[38] McDermott, "Ethnicity, gender now factor in CGA admissions," SFFA-USNA-000146; *see also* Jennifer McDermott, "Coast Guard Cadet Diversity Surges With Minority Wave," Diverse Issues in Higher Education, July 5, 2010, SFFA-USNA-000275.

[39] McDermott, "Ethnicity, gender now factor in CGA admissions."

were disproportionately members of minority groups) and emphasized programs to boost the

academic skills of students through Coast Guard's prep academy.[40]

C.   Academic research shows that selective universities can employ effective race-neutral strategies.

In the wake of Supreme Court rulings on affirmative action, think tanks and the

academic community have been examining in earnest the use of race-neutral strategies to

promote racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic diversity on campuses. For example, in 2014, the

Lumina Foundation produced a 299-page volume (which I edited) that brought together both

supporters and skeptics of racial preferences to consider the meaning of the Supreme Court's

rulings in *Fisher v. Texas* and to examine the efficacy of race-neutral strategies.[41] The College

Board's Access and Diversity Collaborative produced papers on race-neutral policies,

including "The Playbook: A Guide to Assist Institutions of Higher Education in Evaluating

Race-and Ethnicity-Neutral Policies in Support of the Mission-Related Diversity Goals."[42]

The American Council on Education surveyed 338 colleges on their use of race-neutral

strategies.[43]

After the Supreme Court's 2023 decision in *Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard,* the

interest and research on race-neutral alternatives intensified. For example, in September 2023,

---

[40] Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, June 19, 2009.

[41] Kahlenberg (ed), The Future of Affirmative Action, *supra.*

[42] *See, e.g.*, Arthur L. Coleman, Teresa E. Taylor, & Katherine E. Lipper, "The Playbook: A Guide to Assist Institutions of Higher Education in Evaluating Race- and Ethnicity-Neutral Policies in Support of the Mission-Related Diversity Goals," *College Board and Education Counsel*, October 2014, http://educationcounsel.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/ADC%20Playbook%20October%202014%20(for%20posting%20to%20website).pdf.

[43] Lorelle L. Espinosa, Matthew N. Gaertner, & Gary Orfield, "Race, Class, and College Access: Achieving Diversity in a Shifting Legal Landscape" *American Council on Education*, 2015, http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Race-Class-and-College-Access-Achieving-Diversity-in-a-Shifting-Legal-Landscape.pdf.

the U.S. Department of Education produced a 66-page report on "Strategies for Increasing Diversity and Opportunity in Higher Education." The report noted: "While the SFFA decision limited the ability of colleges and universities to consider an applicant's race in and of itself as a factor in deciding whether to admit the applicant, there remain legally permissible ways to advance the critical mission of socioeconomic and racial diversity in American colleges and universities."[44]

Over the years, valuable research has emerged identifying concrete ways in which universities can increase racial diversity through race-neutral means. For example, in 2014, Professors Anthony Carnevale, Stephen Rose, and Jeff Strohl of Georgetown University examined how socioeconomic affirmative action programs, percentage plans, or a combination of the two, could work at the nation's most selective 193 institutions.[45] The authors found that if these schools used socioeconomic preferences, which would include a mix of considerations (such as parental education, income, savings, and school poverty concentrations), the combined Black and Hispanic representation would *rise* from 11% to 13%—all without the use of racial preferences. Under a different simulation (in which the top 10% of test takers in every high school was among the pool admitted to this collection of schools), the authors found that Black and Hispanic representation would rise from 11% to 17%. Under each of these scenarios, socioeconomic diversity and mean SAT scores would also rise.[46]

---

[44] *See* U.S. Department of Education, "Strategies for Increasing Diversity and Opportunity in Higher Education," September 2023, 1, https://sites.ed.gov/ous/files/2023/09/Diversity-and-Opportunity-in-Higher-Education.pdf.

[45] Carnevale, Rose, & Strohl, "Achieving Racial and Economic Diversity with Race-Blind Admissions Policy," in The Future of Affirmative Action, *supra*; *see also* David Leonhardt, "If Affirmative Action Is Doomed, What's Next?" New York Times, June 17, 2014.

[46] Carnevale, Rose, & Strohl, "Achieving Racial and Economic Diversity with Race-Blind Admissions Policy," in The Future of Affirmative Action, *supra*, p. 192, Tables 15.1, 15.2. The

In addition, in a 2015 study, Professor Sigal Alon found that if the most selective 115 American universities instituted broad reform—including effectively eliminating[47] legacy, athletic, and racial preferences—a socioeconomic boost "could not only replicate the current level of racial and ethnic diversity at elite institutions but even increase it."[48] Professor Alon's model looked at three variations: (1) a "socioeconomic status" model, which looks at family-based economic disadvantages; (2) a "structural" model, which looks at neighborhood-based economic disadvantages; and (3) a "multidimensional" model, which looks at both. Professor Alon found that racial diversity would meet or exceed current admissions and socioeconomic diversity would increase under all three models. Meanwhile, because mean SAT scores would remain steady, "all this could be done without jeopardizing academic selectivity."[49]

In 2018, Professor Arcidiacono and I simulated the effect of using race-neutral alternatives at Harvard College and the University of North Carolina.[50] As Justice Gorsuch noted in his concurring opinion in *SFFA v. Harvard,* the research showed that "Harvard could nearly replicate the current racial composition of its student body without resorting to race-based practices if it: (1) provided socioeconomically disadvantaged applicants just half of the

---

study's breakdown is as follows: Status quo (4% African American, 7% Hispanic; 14% from the bottom socioeconomic half; 1230 mean SAT); Admissions by test score (1% African American, 4% Hispanic; 15% bottom socioeconomic half; 1362 mean SAT); Socioeconomic affirmative action (3% African American, 10% Hispanic; 46% from bottom socioeconomic half; 1322 mean SAT); Top 10% of test takers from every high school (6% African American, 11% Hispanic; 31% from bottom socioeconomic half; 1254 mean SAT). *Id.*

[47] Alon effectively eliminates athletic, legacy, and racial preferences by replacing those students in the weakest academic quartile—whom she presumes includes those for whom preferences were decisive—with the most academically competitive economically disadvantaged students of all races.

[48] Sigal Alon, Race, Class, and Affirmative Action (Russell Sage Foundation, 2015), pp. 254-56, Figure 11 and 268-269, Table A8.2.

[49] *Id.* at 256.

[50] *See e.g.,* Richard D. Kahlenberg, "Expert Rebuttal Report, *SFFA v. Harvard,*" Appendix (Simulation 7); and Richard D. Kahlenberg, "Expert Reply Report, *SFFA v. UNC,*" 57-61.

tip it gives recruited athletes; and (2) eliminated tips for the children of donors, alumni and faculty."[51]

More recently, a 2023 Georgetown University study found that a comprehensive approach could produce robust levels of racial diversity. Anthony Carnevale and two colleagues found that in Model 3, a system of socioeconomic preferences that also eliminated preferences for legacies and other privileged groups and expanded the applicant pool through better recruitment, would yield an *increase* in racial diversity.[52]

In addition, a 2024 Brookings Institute study, conducted by Philip Levine and Sarah Reber, found the most selective 153 colleges and universities could roughly replicate their current levels of racial diversity, and maintain high academic standards, if they adopted meaningful preferences (equivalent to a 200-point SAT boost) for students eligible for federal Pell grants.[53]

Finally, a 2024 study by Stanford professor Sean Reardon, conducted in conjunction with reporters at the New York Times, found that at the most selective 80 or so colleges and universities, it was possible to meet and exceed current levels of Black and Hispanic representation using race-neutral strategies. The research found that Black and Hispanic students taken together currently represented 23% of the student population. If test scores were the sole measure of admission, that share would drop to 11%. But providing an

---

[51] *SFFA v. Harvard*, 600 U.S. 181, 300 (2023) (Gorsuch, J., concurring).
[52] Anthony Carnevale, Zachary Mabel and Kathryn Peltier Campbell, "Race-Conscious Affirmative Action: What's Next?" (Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce, March 2023), 12 and 59 (Model 3), https://cew.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/cew-race_conscious_affirmative_action-fr.pdf.
[53] *See* Phillip Levine and Sarah Reber, "Can colleges afford class-based affirmative action?" Brookings Institution, December 11, 2023, Table 1 (model providing a 200-point SAT point boost), https://www.brookings.edu/articles/can-colleges-afford-class-based-affirmative-action/

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

admissions preference to an impressive group of "outliers"—students who scored 250 points higher on the SAT than expected given the socioeconomic status of their families and high schools—would boost the combined Black and Hispanic share to 25%. And if colleges admitted outliers and also did a better job or recruiting talented underrepresented minority students to apply, the share of Black and Hispanic students would rise further, to 32%. In all these scenarios, average SAT scores would remain above 1300 (the 91st percentile of students nationally).[54]

D.   Well-crafted race-neutral strategies do not compromise academic quality.

Critics may argue that race-neutral alternatives will reduce academic standards. But experience and research refute that claim. For example, after UCLA Law School adopted a socioeconomic preferences program, the school's California bar exam passage rate rose to an all-time high.[55] Likewise, in a national simulation, Professors Carnevale and Rose found that top universities could nearly quadruple the proportion of students from the bottom socioeconomic half (from 10% of all students, the level they found in their research, to 38%) without any change in graduation rates.[56]

These studies are buttressed by a growing body of research on "undermatching," in which highly qualified students do not apply to selective colleges. Professor Caroline Hoxby

---

[54] Aatish Bhatia and Emily Badger, "We Tried to Create a Diverse College Class Without Affirmative Action," *New York Times*, March 9, 2024 (Models 3 and 4), conducted by Sean Reardon, https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2024/03/09/upshot/affirmative-action-alternatives.html; and College Board, "SAT Nationally Representative and User Percentiles," https://research.collegeboard.org/reports/sat-suite/understanding-scores/sat.

[55] Sander, "The Use of Socioeconomic Affirmative Action at the University of California," *supra*, p. 107.

[56] Anthony P. Carnevale & Stephen J. Rose, "Socioeconomic Status, Race/Ethnicity, and Selective College Admissions," in America's Untapped Resource: Low-Income Students in Higher Education, ed. Richard D. Kahlenberg (The Century Foundation Press, 2004), pp. 148-49.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

of Stanford and Professor Christopher Avery of Harvard have found that 35,000 low-income students are high achieving, but that only one-third apply to one of the country's 238 most selective colleges. Of those low-income, high-achieving students, roughly 2,000 are African American and 2,700 are Hispanic.[57] Additional research has found that 43% of students who are academically qualified to gain admission to selective colleges undermatch, and that many are Hispanic and African American.[58] In raw numbers, that translates into 4,000 Hispanic and 2,000 African-American SAT takers who have the strongest academic credentials yet do not attend a highly selective school.[59] This research indicates that there is enormous potential to increase socioeconomic and racial diversity without in any way sacrificing academic quality if colleges were aggressively recruiting high-achieving, low-income students.

V.   USNA failed to fully consider any of the numerous race-neutral alternatives that could achieve the educational benefits of diversity.

The Supreme Court's instructions regarding race-neutral alternatives are clear. Whether or not USNA can show it has a "distinct" interest (or set of interests) that are "compelling," it still must comply with the Constitution's requirement that racial preferences be "narrowly tailored." Specifically, the Court has held that universities must demonstrate that "no workable race-neutral alternatives" would satisfy their compelling interest(s).[60]

This requirement has been widely discussed in the academic community.[61] In a 2013 article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education,* for example, Harvard professor Thomas Kane and

---

[57] Caroline M. Hoxby & Christopher Avery, "The Missing 'One-Offs': The Hidden Supply of High-Achieving, Low Income Students," NBER Working Paper no. 18586, December 2012, p. 34.

[58] Alexandria Radford & Jessica Howell, "Addressing Undermatch: Creating Opportunity and Social Mobility," in The Future of Affirmative Action, *supra*, p. 134,

[59] *Id.*

[60] *Fisher*, 133 S. Ct. 2411, 2420 (2013).

[61] *See, e.g.*, Arthur L. Coleman & Teresa E. Taylor, "Emphasis Added: Fisher v. University of Texas and Its Practical Implications for Institutions of Higher Education," in The Future of Affirmative Action, *supra*, 50-51.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

James Ryan (now the president of the University of Virginia) noted that the *Fisher* decision meant that "[t]o consider race in admissions . . . institutions must prove to courts that race-neutral alternatives—such as relying on socioeconomic status or where students live—will not work."[62] Kane and Ryan then suggested ways in which colleges and universities could assess the availability of race-neutral alternatives.[63] They noted: "colleges could review their admissions folders (or at least a representative sample of them) and have admissions officers flag the family-background factors that are potential race-neutral alternatives. Analysts could then estimate how much those factors would have to be weighted (and other factors diminished) in order to produce the outcomes now produced with race-conscious admissions. They could then compare the results of race-conscious and race-neutral policies on individual dimensions—like test scores or high-school grades—or on combinations of traits such as academic indices."

The authors warned that "few universities and colleges are prepared to answer the questions that courts will soon be asking. If they fail to prepare convincing answers, they will lose. And, having been put on notice, responsibility for that loss will be with our college and university leaders, not our courts."[64]

In the case at hand, USNA confidently asserts that it "has considered several alternate race-neutral methods to increase the racial and ethnic diversity of the Brigade of Midshipman, but they have not been effective to date."[65] Yet evidence produced in this case to date shows

---

[62] Thomas J. Kane and James E. Ryan, "Why 'Fisher' Means More Work for Colleges," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 29, 2013.
[63] *Id.*
[64] *Id.*
[65] Latta Declaration, 38.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

that USNA did not even conduct a rudimentary simulation of how well alternatives might work.

As a first step, in order to know whether race could be eliminated from the process, one might expect USNA to try and quantify the weight currently provided to race and then test what would happen if it eliminated the impact of race on admissions. It would next want to test what would happen if it adopted a number of alternatives, such as increasing the weight provided to race-neutral factors such as family income and wealth, neighborhood poverty level, and school poverty level. Nothing produced in the record to date suggests USNA ever conducted these basic analyses. Indeed, when the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs inquired in August 2022: "Is there modeling about what the classes would look like without consideration of race?" S.S. Buck, the Superintendent of the USNA responded: "No modeling has been completed to evaluate the admissions implications of not considering race."[66] When asked, "What are the processes the academy has undertaken to consider race-neutral alternatives?" Superintendent Buck described outreach efforts to encourage minority applications but offered nothing more.[67]

In addition, in order to test whether race-neutral alternatives are "workable" or "unworkable," USNA would need to establish a clear definition of success. What level of racial diversity is necessary to achieve USNA's goals: to allow "an essential exchange of differing experiences," foster "military cohesion," create an environment "where everyone feels they belong," and "promote institutional legitimacy"?[68] USNA at one point defines success as a program that "would lead to a similar racial composition for the class of 2026" as

---

[66] USNA-00022271
[67] USNA-00022271-272
[68] Latta Declaration, 34-36.

achieved using racial preferences.[69] But to date USNA has produced no research to establish a rationale for why the *precise level* of racial composition for the class of 2026 is required in order to meet its larger objectives (such as military cohesion). Nowhere did it engage in a study to see whether a race-neutral alternative that achieved, say, 75% or 85% as much racial diversity could meet their larger objectives.

Instead of conducting a set of simulations that were aimed at seeing whether race-neutral strategies could achieve clearly articulated goals, USNA instead "ran informal reports using the AIS system [Admissions Information System] to determine if variables, other than race, would lead to a similar racial composition for the class of 2026." USNA then references five simple spreadsheets, none of which include a narrative explaining precisely what these "reports" sought to demonstrate.[70]

Two of the spreadsheets list the names, races, and ethnicities of students who accepted offers and were deemed to have faced hardship or adversity. One included about 100 names for the class of 2026 and the other about 130 names for the class of 2027.[71] It is not entirely clear what the point of this exercise was. If one were trying to assess the impact of providing a preference based on "hardship" or "adversity" rather than race, one would want to know the racial makeup of the *applicants* who faced hardship or adversity, not those *admitted*, and test the impact of applying a variety of differently sized race-neutral adversity or hardship

---

[69] Defendants Objections and Supplemental Responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories at 7, March 5, 2024. In another document, USNA laid out an aspirational level of diversity higher than its existing level: establishing a goal to "increase diversity of the Brigade to better re[f]lect demographic of the Navy." USNA-00000542.

[70] Defendants Objections and Supplemental Responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories, at 7, March 5, 2024.

[71] USNA-00000500; *accord* USNA-00000502.

preferences on the racial makeup and academic readiness of the resulting class. The spreadsheet does none of these things.

Another spreadsheet, entitled "Profile-Other RAB with reason," lists the names of those admitted for "other reason" including some of whom which cite "SES," a common abbreviation for socioeconomic status. No racial or ethnic data is included in the spreadsheet.[72] It is unclear what the spreadsheet is meant to demonstrate. And in any event, as with the first set of spreadsheets, it only lists admitted students, not those who applied and provides no simulation of the effect of implementing a race-neutral strategy.

An additional spreadsheet, entitled "Profile – Language at Home not English" lists the names, races, and ethnicities of under 100 students who accepted offers. Although many of them listed English as a second language, strangely, not all of them did. As with the other spreadsheets, there is no narrative provided, and the relevance is unclear given that the documents show admitted students (rather than applicants) and includes no simulation.[73]

The final spreadsheet shows a list of names, races, and ethnicities of fewer than 150 students who accepted offers and are identified as first-generation Americans. As with the other spreadsheets, there is no narrative provided, and the relevance is unclear given that the document shows admitted students rather than applicants and contains no simulations.[74]

The cursory nature of the exploration of race-neutral alternatives raises questions about the research basis for other USNA claims about race-neutral strategies. For example, Stephen Latta, Dean of Admissions, asserts: "USNA's use of race and ethnicity in the admissions process has become more limited in recent years."[75] But without a quantitative

---

[72] USNA-00000501.
[73] USNA-00000503.
[74] USNA-00000504.
[75] Latta Declaration at 32.

analysis of the effect of race, how can that be known? Likewise, Dean Latta asserts that USNA has increased its the reliance of race-neutral alternatives. He contends: "since I arrived at USNA in 2002, we added substantive questions about applicants' backgrounds, such as questions concerning life experiences, language fluency, and whether the applicant is a first-generation college student, and we have increased our reliance on race-neutral factors to ensure a diverse brigade in all aspects."[76] Adding questions about socioeconomic background is a welcome first step. But without a statistical analysis of the weight provided to these factors in practice, how can Dean Latta be confident that "we have increased our reliance" on race-neutral strategies? As discussed below, the statistical analysis conducted by Professor Arcidiacono comes to a stunning conclusion: the impact of first-generation status and economic disadvantage, when coupled with preferences provided to advantaged students, actually have a net *negative* rather than positive effect on admissions after controlling for the strength of an applicant's record.[77]

Throughout this period of time, there were numerous race-neutral alternatives available that have the potential to obtain the benefits of diversity, and which USNA certainly could have considered and potentially adopted. Indeed, as noted above, the Coast Guard Academy adopted some of these strategies and saw great success in achieving diversity without considering race. I discuss options available to USNA below. It is important to recognize that the race-neutral approaches outlined below are not mutually exclusive. In fact, the most promising approaches are likely to be those that work in combination with one another. The cumulative effect of the alternatives is often much greater than any one of them employed in isolation.

---

[76] Latta Declaration at 32.
[77] *See* discussion in Section VI, infra.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

A. USNA could provide socioeconomic preferences.

USNA could provide socioeconomic preferences as a race-neutral strategy to achieve racial and socioeconomic diversity.

1. Socioeconomic factors such as income and wealth are highly correlated with race.

Well-crafted race-neutral alternatives, while not providing a racial preference, are nevertheless cognizant of the ways in which past and present racial discrimination shapes opportunities in America. Race-neutral alternatives based on socioeconomic factors in particular tend to produce racial diversity because economic disadvantage is often influenced by the legacy of racial discrimination. Black and Hispanic Americans, on average, have lower incomes that white Americans. In 2022, the median household income of all Americans was $74.580. The median household income for non-Hispanic white households was $81,060 but the median family income for Black households was $52,860 and for Hispanic households was $62,800.[78]

Moreover, Black and Hispanic households with the same income levels as white households tend to be disadvantaged in three additional ways: they live in neighborhoods with higher concentrations of poverty; they have lower amounts of wealth; and they are more likely to grow up in single parent households. Because of racial segregation in the residential housing market, researchers have found that Black *middle-income* families typically live in more disadvantaged neighborhoods than *low-income* white families.[79] While 6% of young white people

---

[78] See U.S. Census Bureau, "Real Median Household Income by Race and Hispanic Origin: 1967-2022, https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/visualizations/2023/demo/p60-279/figure2.pdf.

[79] John R. Logan, Brian D. Stults, and Rachel McKane, "Less Separate, No Less Equal," Brown University, September 27, 2022, https://s4.ad.brown.edu/Projects/Diversity/data/report/report0727.pdf

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

live in neighborhoods with more than 20% poverty rates, 66% of African American youth live in such neighborhoods.[80]

Likewise, Professor Dalton Conley of New York University finds that a family's wealth (rather than income) better reflects the nation's legacy of slavery and segregation because wealth is handed down from generation to generation.[81] African Americans typically have incomes that are 70% of white incomes, but African-American wealth is just 10% of white wealth.[82] Moreover, parental wealth and education are far more powerful predictors of college completion than race or income, Conley finds.[83] Wealth matters more than income because "educational advantages are acquired through major capital investments and decisions," such as purchasing a home in a neighborhood with good public schools.[84]

Growing up in single-parent household also poses additional challenges. Students who grow up in a home with just one parent face extra obstacles in fully developing their talents, according to a broad body of research.[85] Moreover, this challenge is one disproportionately borne by Black and Hispanic students. In 2022, 45.6% of Black youth lived with their mothers

---

[80] *See* Patrick Sharkey, Stuck in Place: Urban Neighborhoods and the End of Progress Toward Racial Equality, Figure 2.1 (University of Chicago Press, 2013), p. 27.

[81] Dalton Conley, "The Why, What, and How of Class-Based Admissions Policy," in *The Future of Affirmative Action*, *supra*, p. 209. *See also* Lisa J. Dettling, Joanne W. Hsu, Lindsay Jacobs, Kevin B. Moore, & Jeffrey P. Thompson, "Recent Trends in Wealth-Holding by Race and Ethnicity: Evidence from the Survey of Consumer Finances," Federal Reserve FEDS Notes, September 27, 2017 (Black median family wealth was 10.3% of white median family wealth in 2016, and Hispanic wealth was 12.1% of white wealth. Meanwhile, black median family income was 57.8% of white median family income and Hispanic income was 62.9% of white income.); and Emily Moss, Kriston McIntosh, Wendy Edelberg, and Kristen Broady, "The Black-white wealth gap left Black households more vulnerable," Brookings Institution, December 8, 2020, https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-black-white-wealth-gap-left-black-households-more-vulnerable/

[82] Conley, "The Why, What, and How of Class-Based Admissions Policy," *supra*, p. 209.

[83] *Id.* at 206.

[84] *Id.* at 207.

[85] *See, e.g.*, Melissa S. Kearney, The Two-Parent Privilege: How Americans Stopped Getting Married and Started Falling Behind (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2023).

in single parent households, compared with 24.5% of Hispanic youth and 16.7% of white youth.[86]

As a result, research finds that when socioeconomic affirmative action programs are constructed using a wide variety of variables—not just parental income, but factors such as wealth/net worth, and neighborhood and school levels of poverty and single parent household status—they can produce substantial racial and ethnic diversity, because this wider array of socioeconomic factors better captures the economic impact of ongoing and past racial discrimination than does income (or race) alone.

UCLA Law School is an exemplar of an institution that examined factors such as wealth and concentrated poverty to obtain racial diversity. In the fall 2011 entering class, African Americans were 11.3 times as likely to be admitted under the socioeconomic status (SES) program as other programs, and Latinos were 2.3 times as likely to be admitted. African Americans constituted 20.4% of those admitted under the SES program (22 of 108) compared with 0.8% of admissions for non-SES programs (12 of 1,363). Likewise, Hispanics constituted 35.2% of SES admits (38 of 108) compared with 5.5% for non-SES admits (75 of 1,363). Even though the SES program admitted 108 students, compared with 1,363 under non-SES, the absolute number of African Americans admitted under the SES program (22) exceeded the number admitted under other programs (12).[87] Similarly, Professor Richard Sander and Aaron Danielson of UCLA found in a 2014 analysis that richer measures of socioeconomic status, above and beyond income to include factors such as wealth and neighborhood poverty levels,

---

[86] U.S. Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, "Living arrangements of children by race/ethnicity," https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/statistical-briefing-book/population/faqs/qa01202.

[87] Kahlenberg & Potter, "A Better Affirmative Action," p. 14, *supra*.

significantly increased the correlation between race and socioeconomic status and the racial dividend of class-based affirmative action.[88]

Arcidiacono's analysis of USNA data confirms that Black and Hispanic applicants and matriculates are, on average, more socioeconomically disadvantaged than white applicants and matriculates. Twenty percent of Black applicants come from a low-income household compared with 17.5% of Hispanic applicants and just 8.9% of white applicants.[89]

The average white applicant to USNA hails from a zip code in which 22.6% of students are eligible for free and reduced price lunch. For the average Black applicant, 38.7% of the students in the zip code are eligible for subsidized lunch, while for the average Hispanic application, the figure is 34.4% of students.[90]

Among USNA matriculates, the same socioeconomic disparities exist. The average Black student come from zip codes in which 28.8% of students are eligible for subsidize lunch, and average Hispanic applicant from zip codes where 32% of residents are eligible. For white students, the comparable eligibility rate is 20.6%.[91] Black and Hispanic USNA applicants and students also come from zip codes where the incomes of adults are lower.[92]

Some criticize race-neutral alternatives as subterfuges seeking a desired racial result covertly. But this thinking has it exactly backwards because the beneficiaries are a very different subset of African-American and Hispanic students than those who usually benefit

---

[88] Richard Sander & Aaron Danielson, "Thinking Hard About 'Race-Neutral' Admissions," 47 University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform 967, 990-991 (2014).

[89] Arcidiacono Report, Appendix H.1.

[90] Arcidiacono Report, Appendix H.1

[91] Arcidiacono Report, Appendix H.1.

[92] The mean Black and Hispanic applicants are from zip codes in in the 63rd and 68th percentiles of income compared with the 74th percentile for white applicants. The mean Black USNA student comes from a zip code in the 69th percentile by income, Hispanic students from the 70th percentile, and white students from the 75th percentile. Arcidiacono Report Appendix H.1.

from racial preferences. The new beneficiaries are more likely to be working-class students and actually to live in segregated neighborhoods. As Georgetown University Law Professor Sheryll Cashin notes, approaches that include consideration of neighborhood disadvantage help "those who are actually disadvantaged by structural barriers" rather than enabling "high-income, advantaged blacks to claim the legacy of American apartheid."[93]

Socioeconomic preferences also avoid two important costs associated with racial preferences: a reinforcement of negative stereotypes and an increase in racial and ethnic antagonism.[94] Polls find that most Americans (including a majority of Black respondents) oppose the use of race or ethnicity as a factor in college admissions, but large majorities favor the consideration of economic disadvantage.[95] Because students of all races who have overcome economic disadvantage are seen as deserving of special consideration, such students are unlikely to face the stigma or resentment that has been directed toward recipients of racial preferences.[96]

2.   USNA's socioeconomic diversity is deeply lacking.

The evidence suggests that USNA's existing student body is deeply lacking in socioeconomic diversity. In the Class of 2026 data, only 12% of students were first-generation college.[97] Arcidiacono analyzed data from five admissions cycles at USNA (the classes of 2023,

---

[93] Sheryll Cashin, *Place Not Race: A New Vision of Opportunity in America* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2014), p. 78.

[94] *Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265, 298-99.

[95] *See e.g.*, Scott Jaschik, "Poll: Public Opposes Affirmative Action," Inside Higher Ed, July 8, 2016 (citing Gallup poll finding 63%-36% opposition to race as a factor in college admissions, but 61%-39% support for considering family economic circumstances in admissions).

[96] Paul M. Sniderman & Thomas Leonard Piazza, The Scar of Race (Harvard University Press, 1993), pp. 102-04. *See also* Robert P. Jones, Daniel Cox, Betsy Cooper, & Rachel Lienesch, "Anxiety, Nostalgia and Mistrust: Findings from the 2015 American Values Survey," Public Religion Research Institute, November 17, 2015, p. 5 (finding resentment associated with racial preferences).

[97] Class of 2026 Snapshot, https://perma.cc/8PAR-PJUU (12% first generation). Although many U.S. colleges consider students to be "first-generation college" if their parents do not

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

2024, 2025, 2026, and 2027) and found that during those years, only 18.9% of his sample of

admitted students at USNA had parents lacking a Bachelor's degree.[98] By contrast, in the U.S.

population as a whole, a majority (51.7%) of adults lack a two-year degree or more, and 62.2%

lacked a four year degree or more.[99]

Likewise, at USNA in the Class of 2026, only 8% of students are tagged as having

faced "hardship or adverse life experiences."[100]

Arcidiacono's data provide further evidence that USNA's student body is far more

socioeconomically advantaged than the general population. Of those who reported household

income, 69% of USNA students came from households making more than $80,000 a year.[101]

In the Class of 2027, 72% reported coming from families making more than $80,000, 18%

came from families making less than $80,000, and 10% did not answer.[102] By comparison, the

median household income in the United States in 2022 was $74,580.[103]

---

have a bachelor's degree, USNA does not provide a clear definition so it may be that they
define students as first-generation college if their parents lack an associate's degree. In the class
of 2027, 13% were the first in their family to attend college. USNA-00003261

[98] Arcidiacono report, A7. *See* Status Quo numbers in Table 1, Simulation 1.

[99] U.S. Census Bureau, "Census Bureau Releases New Educational Attainment Data,"
February 24, 2002, https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2022/educational-
attainment.html (noting in 2021, among adults age 25 and older, 8.9% had less than a high
school degree or equivalent, 27.9% had high school degrees, and 14.9% had completed some
college but not a degree, totaling 51.7%. By contrast 10.5% had an associate degree as their
highest level of school completed; 23.5% had a bachelor's degree as their highest, and 14.4%
had an advanced degree, totaling 48.4% with an associate's degree or higher.)

[100] USNA "Class of 2026 Snapshot," https://perma.cc/8PAR-PJUU

[101] Arcidiacono Report Appendix H.1.

[102] USNA-00006699, Slide 4.

[103] U.S. Census Bureau, "Income in the United States: 2022," September 12, 2023,
https://www.census.gov/library/publications/2023/demo/p60-279.html. For those adults
ages 45-54 years old (a typical age for adults with children of college going age, the median
income in 2022 was $$101,500). *Id.*

USNA matriculates also came from wealthier neighborhoods. USNA students on average came from zip codes where salaries were at the 74th percentile of salaries nationally.[104]

Disturbingly, there appears to be evidence that at least some in the USNA admissions office may even see socioeconomic diversity as a "challenge" to address rather than an opportunity to embrace. In one admissions office power point presentation, "challenges" are said to include the impact of Covid ("virtual learning has affected preparedness for college" and "fewer students applying to military programs") which seem like legitimate problems. But the slide also lists as a challenge "Backgrounds shifts – We see more of these candidates each year: First Generation American, First in Family to attend College, Socioeconomic/adversity, Unique family situations, English is a Second Language."[105] It is striking that the USNA, which sees racial diversity something that will enrich the class, appears to include staff members who take a very different view of students who might bring different socioeconomic backgrounds to campus.

3. USNA could ask applicants to provide additional socioeconomic data.

To facilitate the use of socioeconomic preferences, USNA could ask much more about the socioeconomic background of applicants. Unlike most colleges, USNA does not charge fees to attend, and so it does not have the same need to ascertain detailed financial data from applicants as part of the process of allocating student aid. Tuition, room, board, and health care are free to USNA students in exchange for a five-year commitment of service.[106] But there is, of course, nothing to stop USNA from asking detailed questions on the application for admission itself.

---

[104] Arcidiacono Report Appendix H.1.
[105] USNA-00027476_NET Task Force Mar 22.ppt.
[106] Latta Declaration, 4; Connecticut Veterans, Gatekeeper, 12.

Indeed, USNA already makes some basic queries of applicants. For example, the initial application asks crude questions about whether students self-identify as "disadvantaged" (either yes, or no.)[107] And the full application asks additional questions, including the educational level of applicants' parents as well as family income level, offering five ranges: (1) below $20,000; (2) $20,000-$40,000; (3) $40,000-$60,000; (4) $60,00-$80,000; and (5) above $80,000. USNA also asks applicants questions about their home language and whether they have faced adversity or hardship experiences.[108]

But USNA could do much more. To begin with, USNA could provide additional ranges of income. Currently, as noted above, the vast majority of students come from families making more than $80,000. USNA could implement a more sophisticated system of socioeconomic preferences if it had more granular data above the $80,000 range because that would allow it, for example, to give a modest boost in admissions for students coming from households making between $80,000-$100,000 compared with those coming from households making in excess of $400,000. Research has long found that students perform better on the SAT, on average, at every increment of income, so students who beat the odds may deserve additional consideration.[109]

In addition, because USNA has the home addresses and the name of the high school attended by every applicant, it could use a free tool created by the College Board, called Landscape, which allows admissions officers to type in a student address or high school and

---

[107] Latta Declaration, 11.

[108] These data are used in making adjustments to the WPM, described below.

[109] *See* Claire Cain Miller, "New SAT Data Highlights the Deep Inequality at the Heart of American Education, October 23, 2023 (citing research by Raj Chetty, David Deming and John Friedman), https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2023/10/23/upshot/sat-inequality.html.

learn a great deal of socioeconomic information about applicants' neighborhood and school.[110] The tool was piloted with 50 colleges and universities in 2018-2019, and became available to all institutions in 2020.[111] Based on evidence produced in this case to date, USNA does not use the Landscape tool.

Finally, USNA has not produced any evidence showing that it asks applicants about household wealth. As outlined above, household wealth is a powerful indicator of opportunity in America, and there are enormous gaps between the median wealth of different racial groups. In most cases, these data should be available to applicants to report on an admissions form. Because USNA is a selective college, it is unlikely that most of its applicants are applying only to USNA and no other college. And because virtually all other colleges charge tuition and fees, it is likely that most applicants to USNA need to fill out the FAFSA for other institutions.

USNA's failure to collect granular information about income (above $80,000) or any information about wealth, and the failure to employ the Landscape tool that provides data about the socioeconomic status of neighborhoods and high schools, are all critical omissions. As discussed above, for the purposes of race-neutral analysis, the omission of wealth and neighborhood and school poverty from USNA's data on socioeconomic status is particularly troubling because there is a much higher correlation with those factors than family income, about which USNA does have some information.[112]

---

[110] *See* College Board, Landscape: Comprehensive Data and Methodology Overview, https://secure-media.collegeboard.org/landscape/comprehensive-data-methodology-overview.pdf.

[111] College Board, "Landscape FAQ," https://highered.collegeboard.org/recruitment-admissions/management/landscape/faq.

[112] Conley, "The Why, What, and How of Class-Based Admissions Policy," *supra*, p. 209.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

4. USNA could provide a meaningful boost to socioeconomically disadvantaged students.

Many colleges have long said they "give significant favorable consideration" to economically disadvantaged students in pursuit of socioeconomic alongside racial and ethnic diversity.[113] The rationale is threefold.

First, socioeconomic diversity adds value to the educational experience of students, alongside racial diversity. If one is looking for a lively discussion from students with many different backgrounds, then including a poor white student from a trailer park might add at least as much diversity as a wealthy Black graduate of a prep school. As one University of Pennsylvania Law professor noted, his racially diverse class had "very few students who come from . . . the blue-collar working class. What that means is that no one has any idea what life is like on the other side of the tracks. That leads to a very sterile discussion when it comes to labor law."[114]

Strong empirical research also demonstrates the educational benefits of socioeconomic diversity. In a study of 14,894 students at 88 colleges, for example, Professor Julie Park of the University of Maryland, and her colleagues Nida Denson and Nicholas Bowman, found that cross-racial interaction was maximized when universities were both racially and socioeconomically diverse.[115] The authors found that "a socioeconomically diverse

---

[113] *See* "Brief of Harvard University, Brown University, The University of Chicago, Dartmouth College, Duke University, The University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, and Yale University as Amicus Curiae Supporting Respondents," U.S. Supreme Court in *Grutter v. Bollinger* and *Gratz v. Bollinger*, February 18, 2003, p. 22, n.13.

[114] Clyde Summers, quoted in Steven A. Holmes, "Mulling the Idea of Affirmative Action for Poor Whites," *New York Times*, August 18, 19991, Section 4, 3, https://www.nytimes.com/1991/08/18/weekinreview/the-nation-mulling-the-idea-of-affirmative-action-for-poor-whites.html.

[115] Julie J. Park, Nida Denson, and Nicholas A. Bowman, "Does Socioeconomic Diversity Make a Difference? Examining the Effect of Racial and Socioeconomic Diversity on the Campus Climate for Diversity," 50 American Educational Research Journal 466 (June 2013), p. 478, http://journals.sagepub.com/ doi/abs/10.3102/0002831212468290.

38

institution is associated both with more frequent interactions across race and greater involvement in CCD [curricular/co-curricular diversity] activities."[116]

Kim and colleagues had three possible explanations for this positive result. First, because low-income whites generally have greater experience interacting with minority students in high school than do wealthier whites, they are more likely to engage across racial lines in college.[117] Second, when colleges have more socioeconomic diversity, it is less likely that wealthy white students will socialize strictly with other wealthy white students. Third, having greater racial and socioeconomic diversity "will lead to greater relative equal status between students, which will facilitate intergroup contact."[118] The authors conclude: "Overall, this article provides compelling evidence that engagement with racial diversity … is influenced not just by explicitly racial dimensions of diversity, but also by various forms of socioeconomic diversity."[119]

Second, in trying to identify talent, it makes sense to consider students who have overcome obstacles. Research from Georgetown University's Anthony Carnevale and Jeff Strohl finds that both race and class predict opportunity in America, but socioeconomic status today matters much more. In predicting SAT scores, socioeconomic obstacles are seven times as large as purely racial obstacles.[120]

Third, as noted above, providing socioeconomic preferences to students of all races can disproportionately benefit underrepresented minorities, who can bring the benefits associated with racial diversity.

---

[116] *Id.* at 466-67. *See also id.* at 486.
[117] *Id.* at 471, 473, and 475.
[118] *Id.* at 476-77. *See also id.* at 487-88
[119] *Id.* at 489.
[120] *See* Carnevale and Strohl, "How Increasing College Access Is Increasing Inequality," 170, Table 3.7

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Some universities may provide less of a socioeconomic boost than they claim, but many provide at least a modest boost. Institutions such as Harvard and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, for example, provided a small boost to socioeconomically disadvantaged students (smaller than provided based on race), but it was clearly positive in nature.[121] Other studies have found selective colleges provide a modest boost to working class and low-income students on the order of 130 SAT points for poor students, and 70 SAT points for working class students. This is less than the 310 SAT points provided to Black students, but it is a positive boost nonetheless[122]

At first glance, USNA appears to believe that socioeconomically disadvantaged students deserve a leg up. Its readers guide suggests students are rewarded for overcoming obstacles and awards points for various hurdles surmounted.

As background for this discussion, one important feature in evaluating candidates at USNA is the Whole Personal Multiple (WPM), a quantitative score generally ranging from 40,000-80,000. The WPM is supposed to be largely merit based and includes such factors as test scores, high school grades, extracurricular activities, athletics, recommendations, and the personal interview. Adjustments can then be made through the Recommendation of the

---

[121] *See* Richard D. Kahlenberg, "Expert Report, *SFFA v. Harvard*," October 16, 2017, at 27 (showing positive logit coefficient for disadvantaged students) https://studentsforfairadmissions.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Doc-416-1-Kahlenberg-Expert-Report.pdf ; and Richard D. Kahlenberg "Expert Report, *SFFA v. UNC*," January 12, 2018, at 33-34 (showing positive logit coefficient for first-generation college students in state and out of state applicants), https://affirmativeactiondebate.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/kahlenberg-report-jan-2018.pdf.
[122] *See e.g.,* Thomas J. Espenshade & Alexandria Walton Radford*, No Longer Separate, Not Yet Equal* (Princeton University Press, 2009), p. 92, Table 3.5 (finding that, at highly selective private institutions, the boost provided to African-American applicants is worth 310 SAT points (on a 1600 scale), compared with 130 points for poor students, 70 points for working-class applicants, and (distressingly) 50 points for upper-middle class students, relative to middle-class pupils).

Advisory Board (RAB) to the score for a variety of reasons, including overcoming economic disadvantage, as well as factors such as legacy status.[123]

For the class of 2013, a WPM (including adjustments) of 49,000 put a student at the 1st percentile of all students. A 64,000 score put them at the 50th percentile. A 70,000 score placed students at the 84th percentile. And a 79,000 score put them at the 99th percentile.[124] Typically, a score of 58,000 is a minimum requirement for admissions. Such students are normally in the top 40% of their high school class.[125] Scores over 70,000 are generally required for a LOA, and most applicants above that threshold are marked Early Notify and recommended for a LOA by the board to the Dean of Admissions.[126]

Arcidiacono finds that LOAs are "essentially a guarantee of admission if the applicant is medically and physically qualified."[127]

According to USNA guidance, USNA provides 1,000 points to the WPM for an applicant from a non-English speaking family; 1,000 points for first generation American or first-generation college applicants; 500-2,000 points for overcoming significant adversity or hardship; and 500-2,000 points for having unusual life experience (which could include being from a low socioeconomic background).[128]

---

[123] *See* Latta Declaration, 18-20.   *See also* USNA-00001861-1881 (an extensive 21-page document explaining the WPM).

[124] USNA-00001866

[125] Latta Declaration, 19.

[126] Latta Declaration, 18 (Dkt. 46 at 9). These letters effectively *guarantee* a spot in the Naval Academy. *Id.* at 9 n.4; *accord* Dkt. 46-2 at 24-27. In fact, anyone who "receive[s]" a letter "will receive an offer of appointment to USNA once they successfully complete the remaining application requirement[s]." Dkt. 46-2 at 25. *See also* Latta Declaration, Dkt. 46-2 at 24-27 and USNA Brief, Dkt. 46 at 46-47; Bressler, Biondi, Hwang 30(b)(6) Dep. Tr. 115:4-127:2

[127] Arcidiacono Report, 5.

[128] Latta, 20. Defendants' Objections and Supplemental Responses," 8, citing USNA-00000152, USNA-00000070; USNA-00000078; USNA-000000333 and USNA-000000329. These points can be cumulative, though the total adjustment is capped at 9000 points.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

On the surface, this policy would seem to provide a meaningful boost. In an extreme case, an applicant from a non-English speaking family, who is the first in his or her family to go to college, who has faced the maximum adversity and hardship, and also received the maximum points for unusual life experiences, would see a 6,000-point WPM boost. For the class of 2013, such a boost could move a student from the 50th percentile score (64,000) to the 84th percentile score (70,000).[129] Arcidiacono finds that a 4,000 point boost is the equivalent to a 179 point increase on the Math SAT or a 330 point boost on the Verbal SAT.[130] Moreover, Dean Latta testified that there is no WPM or RAB boost for race, and that it only works in a more opaque "non-determinative" way in the admissions process.[131]

The real-world application of socioeconomic and racial preferences at USNA, however, differs markedly from the guidance provided in official documents. For one thing, USNA's own data suggested its commitment to socioeconomic diversity is modest. One document shows, for example, that only 2.1% of candidates accepted with RAB were for reasons associated with socioeconomic disadvantage.[132] But a statistical analysis by SFFA's expert witness, Peter Arcidiacono of Duke University, shows something much worse.

Astonishingly, Arcidiacono finds that while USNA provides a substantial preference in admissions to racial minorities, it effectively *penalizes* socioeconomically disadvantaged students compared with those who are more socioeconomically advantaged. He concludes, "economically disadvantaged applicants receiv[e] RAB points that are then effectively removed at the admissions stage."[133] This practice is, of course, the opposite of what one might

---

[129] USNA-00001866.
[130] Arcidiacono Report, 15.
[131] Latta Declaration, 19-20, 22, 26-27, 29-31, 36, 44.
[132] USNA-00000501.
[133] Arcidiacono report, 63.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

expect in a fair admissions system that rewards those students who have overcome obstacles and managed to do well despite those hurdles.

Arcidiacono reviewed data from 70,508 applicants from the class of 2023 to the class of 2027 admissions cycles, of which 14,545 were identified as an appropriate dataset because they were non-international, had completed applications, received a nomination, were medically and physically qualified, and had data for all the Whole Personal Multiple (WPM) components.[134] He provides logit estimates of admission which indicate either an increase or decrease in the odds of a student being admitted, all other factors (such as grades, test scores and teacher recommendations) being equal. A large positive logit estimate indicates a large preference. A negative logit estimate indicates a penalty. In rank order of importance, his results (using his Model 6) show the relative weight of certain preferences in USNA's admissions.

The results for overall admissions are presented in Table 1.[135] The overall picture is clear. Racial minorities receive the largest preferences. Black students receive a substantial preference compared with white students as the baseline. Asian, Native American/Hawaiian and Hispanic students receive more modest preferences. USNA deserves credit for not penalizing Asian American students, as some colleges do, although it is somewhat puzzling that Asian American students receive a larger preference in admission than Hispanic students, even though Asian American students are "overrepresented" at USNA and Hispanic students are underrepresented.[136]

---

[134] See Peter Arcidiacono, Expert Report, Table C.1.

[135] *See* Peter Arcidiacono, Expert Report, Table D.82 ("Complete Logit Estimates of USNA Admissions, Removing Blue Chip Athletes and Prep Pool" (Model 6)). Model 6 does not include Blue Chip Athletes, who have a 99.92% admissions rate in Arcidiacono's sample.

[136] Asian American students represent 5.5% of the public school population in the United States in the fall of 2022, but 14.3% of the USNA population. By contrast, Hispanics

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

The next set of preferences tend to benefit more socioeconomically advantaged students: going to high schools with large college going populations, being a USNA legacy, and attending a private high schools.

The very smallest admissions bumps go to socioeconomically disadvantaged students: those attending schools with a high percentage of students eligible for free and reduced price lunch; and being a first-generation college student. Strikingly, students from families that are less socioeconomically advantaged (those making less than $80,000) have a slightly *negative* coefficient

When one considers the cumulative effect of a system in which there are larger preferences for socioeconomically advantaged students than those who are socioeconomically disadvantaged, the net impact is a larger penalty for disadvantaged students. (See further discussion below). This is the reverse of what one might hope, given USNA's alleged commitment to identifying talent among students who have overcome more obstacles than others have faced.

Table 1: Logit Estimate of Admissions

Student Characteristic	Logit Estimate of Admission
Black	2.889
Asian	1.467
Native American/Hawaiian	1.209
% in HS going to 4-year college	1.271
Hispanic	1.152
USNA Legacy	0.523
Female	0.285
Private High School	0.262
% FRL in HS	0.158
First-generation college	0.049
Household Income less than $80,000	-0.094

represented 29% of the public school population in the United States in the fall of 2022 but 12.5% of the USNA population. *See* Table 1 (Status quo) and National Center for Education Statistics, "Racial/Ethnic Enrollment in Public Schools, May 2024, https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cge/racial-ethnic-enrollment.

In his declaration, Dean Latta claimed that a socioeconomic approach "has not been successful at increasing diversity" at USNA because "many non-diverse applicants also benefit from such considerations."[137] Latta also claimed that first-generation college students could be prioritized, but "a review of recent classes admitted indicated that the number of first-generation college candidates applying to USNA was so small that it has not made a significant impact on the diversity of the incoming class."[138]

These statements are deeply troubling on several levels. To begin with, it is telling that in Latta's language, race alone apparently is what matters when it comes to contributing to a diverse environment. Low-income white students, who surely offer something distinctive to the student body, are, in Latta's telling, "non-diverse." Second, as outlined above, certain aspects of socioeconomic status—including wealth (net worth) and neighborhood poverty levels—are in fact significantly correlated with race, both nationally and at USNA. Third, USNA claims that race-neutral alternatives can't produce racial diversity because the number of admitted first-generation college students is "so small," showing a lack of understanding of how race-neutral strategies work. If USNA took meaningful efforts to *expand* the share of the class beyond its current "small" share, then the race-neutral strategy might well work to produce racial diversity. The "small" number of low-income students is not an immutable fact of life over which USNA has no control.

In sum, USNA could eliminate its penalty against first-generation, low-income, and working-class students and instead provide a meaningful preference in admissions as an important race-neutral strategy.

---

[137] Latta Declaration at 39.
[138] Latta Declaration at 39.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

B.   USNA could increase the share of enlisted members admitted.

USNA could also increase the share of enlisted members admitted to the entering class as a race-neutral alternative to racial preferences. In his declaration, Dean Latta pointed out that "certain non-white racial demographics are overrepresented in the enlisted population" in the Navy and Marine Corps. Arcidiacono's analysis provides confirming evidence. Of the non-international matriculates, 14% of the overall USNA population reported prior military service. But Black and Hispanic students were especially likely to do so. While 9.8% of white and 9.7% of Asian matriculates reported prior military service, 33.7% of Black and 20.5% of Hispanic did so. Likewise, those reporting prior military service were far more likely to report income of below $80,000 than the general USNA population.[139]

Latta claims that recruiting more of the enlisted population to apply to USNA would have a "minimal impact" on racial diversity, because enlisted men and women "make up only approximately 5% of a given class."[140] That may be true enough, but as was the case with first-generation college students, USNA could expand the number of enlisted members whom it admits beyond 5%. Given the higher levels of racial diversity found among enlisted men and women, USNA could boost the share of enlisted members in its incoming class as a race-neutral means of achieving racial and ethnic diversity. (Doing so could well boost socioeconomic diversity as well.)

---

[139] Of those reporting prior military service, 57.1% (of the 74.4% reporting an income category) report annual household incomes of less than $80,000. Arcidiacono Report, Appendix H.4.

[140] Latta Declaration at 38. Enlisted representation at USNA fluctuated between 3% and 6% between class of 2014 to class of 2023 USNA-00000535. *See also* USNA-00003010 (prior enlisted varied from between 34 in 2014 to 68 in 2020).

C.   USNA could increase its recruitment efforts.

USNA could also increase its recruitment efforts of underrepresented minority students and socioeconomically disadvantaged students in the applicant pool.

The Supreme Court has long recognized that outreach efforts that target underrepresented minority students to apply are distinct from admissions preferences that consider race. Indeed, special efforts to encourage underrepresented populations to apply is considered a race-neutral strategy and is widely supported.[141]

USNA claims that its increase in diversity is "primarily the result of our Admissions Outreach to underrepresented areas," but USNA's own documents indicate it has not adequately invested in this approach.[142] In March 2021, USNA's "Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan" recognized that it could be doing much more to recruit underrepresented minority students to apply. The plan called for USNA to "Develop a grassroots campaign to increase recruiting in communities with large populations of underrepresented minorities and socio-economically disadvantaged students."[143] The strategic plan then outlined four action steps:

> (1) "Build relationships and networks with middle and high schools in communities with large populations of unrepresentative minorities to communicate the value of a USNA education and a career as a Navy or Marine Corps officer."
> (2) "Expand programs for partnering with local corporations to engage middle and high school annually in areas of STEM and leadership."
> (3) "Build relationships and networks with external organizations with access to students and parents from unrepresented populations such as American Indian Science and Engineering Society, Naval Academy Minority Association, National Society of Black Engineers to communicate the value of a USNA education and a career as a Navy or Marine Corps officer."

---

[141] *See e.g. Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle* 551 U.S. 701, 789 (Kennedy, J., concurring) ("School boards may pursue the goal of bringing together students of diverse backgrounds and races through other means, including …. recruiting students and faculty in a targeted fashion.").

[142] USNA-00024646.

[143] USNA, "Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan," 6, USNA-00000398.

(4) "Expand and maintain a current list of contacts such as principals, guidance counselors, church leaders and local business leaders. Reinstate USNA visitation trips for contacts, provide marketing materials, and measure outcomes based on future admissions."[144]

But in years prior to the publication of the strategic plan, and in the years following, USNA—by its own admission—consistently failed to invest in recruitment strategies and fell short of its recruitment goals. Students interested in USNA go through a two-part process: an initial application, followed by a full application.[145] Dean Latta's USNA Institutional Assessment Reports for AY 20, AY 21, AY 22 and AY 23 show a consistent pattern. Year after year, Latta reports that USNA *failed* at its outreach and recruitment goals. In two of the four years, USNA failed at its goal to increase preliminary applications.[146] And in four out of four years, it failed to meet its goals for full, completed applications.

In AY 20 USNA failed to achieve its goal of increasing completed applications.[147] In AY 21, it failed to achieve a goal of 40% completion. Only 31% completed applications, including 25.6% of minority applicants.[148] In AY22, USNA downgraded its goal to a 35% completion rate, and still did not achieve it, with only 32.4% completing, including 24.2% of Black students and 27.9% of Hispanic students.[149] In AY 23, USNA again failed to meet the 35% completion rate and minority students in particular continued to lag; the Black completion rate was 29.0% and Hispanic rate was 29.5%.[150]

---

[144] *Id.*
[145] USNA-00001368.
[146] USNA-00001369 (AY 20 failed); USNA-00001363 (AY 21 succeeded); USNA-00001372 (AY 22 failed); USNA-00001378 (AY 23 achieved).
[147] USNA-00001370.
[148] USNA-00001363.
[149] USNA-00001373.
[150] USNA-00001379.

An April 2023 document conceded that "USNA has continued to struggle in attracting 'qualified' underrepresented groups, particularly African American and Hispanic students who are also actively sought by Ivy League, other elite schools, and other service academies."[151]

Importantly, Latta does not say that recruitment efforts failed because they were ineffective. To the contrary, in one report Latta notes that "our data shows that campus visits results in high application and application completion rates." In particular, he pointed to the INSPIRE program, which pairs underrepresented minority students with minority midshipmen and showed "a nearly 98% application completion rate for students who attended."[152] This compares with a 32% completion rate for applicants overall.[153]

Instead, Latta said the problem is that USNA fails to invest resources into workable recruitment strategies. Reflecting on AY 20, Latta said "the Office of Admissions Cost Center continues to be challenged with operating in a fiscally constrained environment punctuated by reduced manning." Latta observed: "we have been chronically understaffed," and pointed out that the "only two African American officers assigned are scheduled to leave by March with no reliefs identified." He concluded: "Unless we are properly funded, staffed, and supported, opportunities to continue to improve our performance will be severely limited."[154] Reflecting on AY 22, Latta observed, "The Office of Admissions Cost Center continues to be challenged with fiscal and personnel constraints," and "the Office of Admissions Budget continues to be unsupported." Reflecting on AY 23, Latta wrote: "The Office of Admissions Cost Center continues to be challenged with fiscal and personnel constraints." Because of "budget shortfalls," he said, USNA had a "decreased ability to conduct several outreach opportunities,

---

[151] USNA-00004423.
[152] USNA-00001376; and USNA-00003264.
[153] USNA-00003264.
[154] USNA-00001370-1371.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

including INSPIRE." The Office of Admissions, he said, was facing "severe manning shortfalls."[155]

In one Power Point presentation entitled "Moving the Needle," which appears designed to inspire recruiters to increase the number of minority and Black applicants who initiate and then complete their application, the author notes the need for innovation. "If we keep doing what we've been doing, we'll keep getting what we've been getting."[156]

But the problems persist to the current day. In a document that describes the efforts to recruit the class of 2028, the admissions staff noted: "Admissions has continued to be underfunded to support various outreach programs." The shortfalls have been significant. The staff noted: "An annual requirement of nearly $3.15 M in OM, N and $2.3 M in gift funds have been identified, but draft controls have provided Admissions shortfalls of about $1.1M OM, N and $900K gift funds. In recent years, the need to conduct internet advertising, texting, social media, etc. to keep pace with competitor institutions have added expenses not provided in the POM. The need for additional social media support was highlighted as a shortfall in a recent audit by the Boston Consulting Group, which ranked USNA behind both USAFA and USMA in brand awareness. Additionally, while other cost centers benefitted greatly in the recent capital campaign conducted by the USNA Foundation, very little support was generated for the Office of Admissions."[157]

The Boston Consulting Group (BCG) analysis to which USNA staff referred also found that there was lower awareness about USNA among lower income zip codes and Black, Hispanic, and Asian populations. Compared with other schools, BCG found "USNA lags in

---

[155] USNA-00001383.
[156] USNA-00023783.
[157] USNA-00002274.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

digital presence especially pronounced among minority groups."[158] BCG recommended "USNA should invest more in admissions (appropriated and donor sourced), including: Improving social media reach to bring in a larger pool of applicants and more competitive classes; Deepening engagement in geographies where USNA appointments are under-competitive; and Better leveraging USNA's massive cohort of BGOs to out-compete other service academies on awareness."[159]

Interestingly, in each of the institutional reports, despite the shortfalls in recruitment, USNA *succeeds* at achieving racial diversity in enrollment goals. In AY 20, USNA achieved "the third most diverse class admitted" with 36.3% considered "diverse."[160] In AY 21, USNA had "the most diverse class ever admitted," with 40.9% of students diverse.[161] In AY 22, USNA admitted "the second most diverse class ever" with 40.7% of students considered diverse.[162] In AY 23, USNA admitted "the most diverse class ever" with 43.9% of students considered diverse.[163] The Class of 2027 reached "a record high" of 44.4% minority representation.[164]

While the law requires that universities employ race-neutral alternatives as a first resort and racial preferences as only a last resort, USNA appears to engage in the very opposite approach. Rather than do the hard work of achieving diversity by race-neutral means (widening the pool of applicants) USNA consistently underinvests and fails in those efforts, and then it consistently employs racial preferences as a shortcut for its lack of investment in recruitment strategies that show promise

---

[158] USNA-00022581.
[159] USNA-00022569 and USNA-0002257.
[160] USNA-00001370.
[161] USNA-00001364.
[162] USNA-00001373.
[163] USNA-00001379.
[164] USNA-00026956

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Other data produced by USNA confirm its shortfalls. Arcidiacono finds that Black and Hispanic students are a smaller share of the students who complete applications than the general population. Just 9.02% of those completing applications were Black, and just 12.83% were Hispanic.[165]

Only 5.56% of those completing applications were first-generation college.[166] By comparison, as noted above, in the U.S. population as a whole, a majority (51.7%) of adults lack a two-or four-year degree.[167] The failure to recruit first-generation applicants has a racially disparate impact. Nationally, in 2022, among adults ages 25 and older, 47.1% of white people lacked at least an associate's degree, compared with 61.1% of Black people and 70.5% of Hispanic Americans.[168]

Overall, USNA's failure to recruit high-achieving, low-income students, including thousands who are Black and Hispanic, is an enormous missed opportunity. As discussed above, the national data suggest that there is a large reservoir of high achieving low income and minority students whom USNA is not doing a good job of recruiting.

D.   USNA could modify and expand its preparation programs.

USNA could also boost racial diversity without racial preferences by modifying and expanding its preparation programs. About 20% of each year's incoming USNA class comes

---

[165] Arcidiacono Report, 25, Table 3.1

[166] Arcidiacono Report, 131, Table D.1.

[167] U.S. Census Bureau, "Census Bureau Releases New Educational Attainment Data," February 24, 2002, https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2022/educational-attainment.html (noting in 2021, among adults age 25 and older, 8.9% had less than a high school degree or equivalent, 27.9% had high school degrees, and 14.9% had completed some college but not a degree, totaling 51.7%. By contrast 10.5% had an associate degree as their highest level of school completed; 23.5% had a bachelor's degree as their highest; and 14.4% had an advanced degree, totaling 48.4% with an associate's degree or higher.)

[168] American Council on Education, "Educational Attainment of Adults Ages 25 and Older, by Race and Ethnicity: 2022," https://www.equityinhighered.org/indicators/u-s-population-trends-and-educational-attainment/educational-attainment-by-race-and-ethnicity/.

through a preparatory pipeline sponsored by USNA.[169] Promising students who apply to USNA (but are not ready to be admitted directly) may be offered the possibility to attend a 10-month preparatory program and are then re-evaluated for admission in the following year's admissions cycle.[170]

NAPS provides a powerful pathway for ultimate admissions to USNA. In the five cycles Arcidiacono analyzed, the NAPS student admissions rate to USNA was 94.7% among the 98.5% of NAPS students who remained medically and physically qualified.[171]

USNA sponsors two types of preparatory schools: the Naval Academy Preparatory School (NAPS), located in Newport, Rhode Island, which is run directly by USNA, and a set of independent prep schools supported by the Navy Foundation (known as "Foundation Schools").[172] NAPS is tuition-free to students; and Foundation Schools provide some financial aid but require students to pay at least 40% of the tuition.[173] NAPS if by far the largest program. On average, it sent more than five times as many students per year (202) to USNA as Foundation schools (44).[174]

---

[169] Phoebe Kotlikoff, Ahmed S. Rahman, and Katherine A. Smith, "Minding the Gap: Academic Outcomes for Pre-college Programs," IZA Institute of Labor Economics, Discussion Paper No. 14075 (January 2021), 3. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3775980#. In the class of 2026, 195 of 1390 students were from Naval Academy Prep School (14.0%) and 44 of 1390 students were from US Naval Academy Foundation and Civilian Preparatory Program (3.2%). *See* USNA, "Class of 2026 Snapshot," https://perma.cc/8PAR-PJUU

[170] United States Naval Academy, "Naval Academy Preparatory School," https://www.usna.edu/NAPS/FAQ.php#panel1HowdoIapplytoattendNAPS; and Kotlikoff et al, "Are They Worth It?" 4.

[171] Arcidiacono Report, Appendix H.8.

[172] Kotlikoff, et al, "Minding the Gap" 36, Appendix 6.1 (identifying 19 such schools); and USNA-00018829 (identifying 16 foundation schools).

[173] Kotlikoff et al "Minding the Gap" 3-4.

[174] Arcidiacono Report, Appendix H.6.

A large share of preparatory students are racial minorities. In the NAPS class of 2024 (the USNA class of 2028), for example, 156 of 234 NAPS students (67%) were minorities.[175] About 60% of all Black USNA students come through NAPS.[176] In Arcidiacono's data from the classes of 2023-2227, white students comprised just under 39% of all prep students in our data (including 34% of NAPS students). Black students make up 29% of all prep students, including 34% of NAPS students. And Hispanic students were 18% of all prep students, including 18% of NAPS students.[177]

Professor Arcidiacono also finds USNA provides large racial preferences in admissions to NAPS.[178] One study conducted by researchers from the Navy, USNA, and Lehigh University of USNA students who graduated from the classes of 1988 to 2018 found that 19.2% of NAPS students were Black, compared with 3.9% of students admitted directly to USNA, and 18.0% of NAPS students were Hispanic, compared with 6.9% of direct admits.[179]

NAPS also targets student athletes.[180] In the Class of 2023, 69 of 259 (28%) of NAPS students were recruited athletes.[181]

These programs do not appear to be aimed at promoting socioeconomically diversity, even though one might assume that a special preparatory program would be offered to students whose disadvantages did not allow them to flourish to their full potential in high school. The preference for first-generation college and low-income students is very modest

---

[175] USNA-00018835
[176] USNA-00026849
[177] Arcidiacono Report, Appendix H.8.
[178] Arcidiacono Report, Table 4.7
[179] Kotlikoff et al, "Minding the Gap," 8, Table 1.
[180] USNA-00018822.
[181] USNA-00026849

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

compared with the preference for Black, Asian, and Hispanic students.[182] The Navy, USNA, and Lehigh researchers found that NAPS students came from zip codes with about the same median income as those directly admitted to USNA without a preparatory program.[183] Foundation schools had even wealthier student bodies.[184]

The NAPS students who enroll at USNA appear to graduate at high rates. In the class of 2019, the NAPS graduation rate was 90.4%, and the overall graduation rate of all students was 90.2%.[185] A similar program, the U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School (USMAPS), has also been found to be successful by a team of economists who published their study in the National Bureau for Economic Research in 2020.[186]

Given the success of preparation programs, USNA could have explored what would happen if NAPS were modified to be race-neutral and emphasize socioeconomic disadvantage instead of race. On the surface, of course, a program swapping a racial emphasis for a socioeconomic basis might be expected to result in lower URM admissions and higher admissions of socioeconomically disadvantaged students. But USNA could have explored two changes that could produce high levels of racial diversity. For one thing, USNA could have expanded the share of seats at USNA devoted to NAPS students and Foundation schools from about 20% to something higher. For another, NAPS could make the very reasonable policy shift to devote most or even all of its seats to socioeconomically disadvantaged students

---

[182] Arcidiacono Report, Table 4.7.

[183] Kotlikoff et al, "Minding the Gap," 8, Table 1. The regional median income of NAPS students was $58,646 as opposed to $58,331 for direct admits to USNA.

[184] Kotlikoff et al, "Minding the Gap," 8, Table 1 (that median zip code income was $63,040 for foundation schools).

[185] USNA-00000527.

[186] Dario Cestau, Dennis Epple, Richard Romano, Holger Sieg and Carl Wojtaszek, "College Achievement and Attainment Gaps: Evidence from West Point Cadets," NBER Working Paper No. 27162, May 2020, https://www.nber.org/papers/w27162.

on the theory that students who have faced socioeconomic disadvantage are the most likely to benefit from an extra year of preparation. If this were the case, the NAPS might easily maintain or even exceed its 19% Black and 18% Hispanic population given that Black and Hispanic students are much more likely to be socioeconomically disadvantaged than white students.

E.   USNA could reduce or eliminate preferences that favor non-minorities.

USNA also insists on retaining a number of preferential programs that disproportionately benefit wealthy and white students—policies whose elimination could increase socioeconomic and racial diversity. These include preferences for the children of alumni; athletes in boutique sports; and a variety of automatic preference points for students who, through no doing of their own, are fortunate enough to attend wealthy high schools where peers are college bound and AP classes are plentiful. There is no evidence in the record suggesting that USNA explored these options. I discuss each in turn.

1.   Legacy preferences

For years, many elite colleges have employed a system of legacy preference—a system which rewards disproportionately white and socioeconomically advantaged applicants extra points based on lineage rather than individual merit. These preferences have a long and sordid history. As education writer Peter Schmidt has noted, colleges began using legacy preferences for the children of alumni as a strategy for reducing the admissions of Jewish students.[187]

Such preferences tend to benefit wealthy and white students. As the former chief counsel for the Lawyers Committee for Civil and Human Rights, John Brittain, and his coauthor Eric Bloom have noted, even though affirmative action programs had been in place for decades, Black and Hispanic students are still significantly underrepresented among the

---

[187] See Peter Schmidt, "A History of Legacy Preferences and Privileges," in Affirmative Action for the Rich: Legacy Preferences in College Admissions, ed. Richard D. Kahlenberg (New York: Century Foundation press, 2010), p. 42.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

legacy pool at most schools. At Harvard, for example, only 7.6 percent of legacy admits were underrepresented minorities, compared with 17.8 percent of all students; and at the University of Virginia, 91 percent of early decision legacy admits were white, 1.6 percent were Black and 0.5 percent Hispanic.[188] Brittain and Bloom wrote, "affirmative action does not offset legacy preference: the use of legacy preference, in fact, requires college admission officers to rely more heavily on affirmative action."[189]

Since the Supreme Court handed down *Students for Fair Admissions* in June 2023, a number of civil rights groups have called for the elimination of legacy preferences. NAACP president Derrick Johnson called legacy admissions a practice which perpetuates "an inherently racist college admissions process."[190] Since the Supreme Court oral arguments in the Harvard case, some 15 prominent colleges have eliminated legacy preferences.[191] In Virginia and Maryland, bans on legacy preferences passed almost unanimously in the state legislatures and were signed into law.[192]

---

[188] Brittain & Bloom, "Admitting the Truth," supra, 127.

[189] Brittain & Bloom, "Admitting the Truth," *supra*, p. 132.

[190] "NAACP President Commends U.S. Dept. of Education Investigation into Harvard University Legacy Admissions," July 25, 2023 https://naacp.org/articles/naacp-president-commends-us-dept-education-investigation-harvard-university-legacy

[191] See James Murphy, "The Future of Fair Admissions Issue Brief 4: Legacy Admissions Update," Ed Reform Now, December 2023, 10. Table 2, "Prominent Colleges and Universities that Ended Legacy Admissions since December 2022." https://edreformnow.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/The-Future-of-Fair-Admissions-Brief-4-FINAL-1.pdf.

[192] See Colbi Edmonds, "Virginia Bans Legacy Admissions in Public Universities and Colleges," *New York Times*, March 10, 2024; and Jack Hogan, "Md. House votes to end legacy admissions at colleges and universities," *Maryland Daily Record*, February 15, 2024 https://thedailyrecord.com/2024/02/15/md-house-votes-to-end-legacy-admissions-at-colleges-and-universities/ ; and Hallie Miller and Olivia Sanchez, "Maryland becomes the third state to completely ban legacy preferences in admissions," Hechinger Report, May 1, 2024 https://hechingerreport.org/maryland-to-become-the-third-state-to-completely-ban-legacy-preference-in-admissions

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

As with legacies at other universities, children of Academy alumni may enjoy extra advantages in life. (This situation is markedly different from the children of Gold Star service members. Those applicants, who have lost a family member, have faced enormous hardship as a result, and are strong candidates for extra consideration.)[193]

In addition, USNA awards an explicit 500-point boost in the WPM to legacies. Moreover, it appears that USNA may provide an even bigger boost to children of well-connected alumni. USNA's coding of applicant data (known as BART codes) includes one for "Family Relationship – Military Academy Attended, Military Rank."

Likewise, among the USNA's Acronyms list is one for "HIC – High Interest Candidate," who are well connected. USNA documents include, for example, a 2023 list of more than 100 HICs that include those recommended by former U.S. presidents, vice presidents, senators, governors, generals, admirals, vice admirals, donors, faculty members and the like.[194] Having connections and legacy status are, of course, accidents of birth, and their use in admissions contradicts USNA's declared commitment to an admissions system based "on merit."[195]

How many legacy students does USNA admit? USNA claims only 4.3% of Class of 2026 were legacies.[196] But the answer depends very much upon how legacy is defined. If defined as having at least or parent or sibling who attended *any* military service academy, the rate among non-international 2026 matriculates would be 13.1% (6.7% of students had at least

---

[193] Under 10 U.S.C. §8454--the provision that Dean Latta mentioned in the declaration, Dkt. 46-2 ¶43—the president can appoint "one hundred" midshipmen.10 U.S.C. §8454(b)(l). Those appoints don't include gold-star children. *Id.* Instead, they include only "children of [service] members" who "are on active duty," or who "retired" from the service and subsequently died. Id. §8454(b)(1)(B); accord id.§8454(b)(1)(D).

[194] USNA-00019602-USNA-00019608. See also USNA-00018437

[195] Latta Declaration, 6.

[196] https://perma.cc/8PAR-PJUU

one parent legacy and 7.4% having at least one sibling legacy). Because sibling data are often missing, the number could be much higher.[197]

If one defines legacy as a student having at least one parent or sibling who attended USNA, the rate among non-international 2026 matriculates would be 9.7%. About 5.1% of cases had at least one parent legacy and 5.3% of cases had at least one sibling legacy.[198]

As Table 1 above indicates, being a USNA legacy provides a larger boost than being female, having a mother lacking a bachelor's degree, having a father lacking a bachelor's degree, or being from a low-income household.

As with the student populations nationally, USNA's legacy students are disproportionately wealthy and white, and undermine USNA's stated commitment to pursuing race-neutral strategies to diversity. Among admitted students, 6.61% of admitted white students were legacies, compared with 4.13% of admitted Black students, 4.40% of admitted Hispanic students, and 3.35% of admitted Asian students.[199] Among USNA students whose parents attended USNA, 70.7% were White, 96.4% had incomes above $80,000, and they hailed from zip codes at the 80th percentile nationally on average. When legacy is defined as any military service, and includes sibling, the racial and socioeconomic skew is still considerable but less dramatic.[200]

Finally, it should be noted that eliminating legacy preferences is a workable race-neutral strategy. Among the top 10 universities in the widely cited Shanghai rankings, four (Caltech, U.C. Berkeley, Oxford, and Cambridge) do not employ legacy preferences.[201] Research also

---

[197] Arcidiacono Report, Appendix H.9.
[198] Arcidiacono Report, Appendix H.9.
[199] Arcidiacono Expert Report, 41, Table 3.14.
[200] Arcidiacono Expert Report, Appendix H.10
[201] Richard D. Kahlenberg, "Introduction," in Affirmative Action for the Rich, *supra*, p. 8.

finds that the existence of legacy preferences does not increase alumni donations to an institution. In an examination of the top 100 universities in U.S. News & World Report, Chad Coffman of Winnemac Consulting and his colleagues found "no evidence that legacy preference policies themselves exert an influence on giving behavior."[202] USNA did not point to any empirical evidence that legacy preferences had boosted alumni giving at USNA. Eliminating this preferential program for largely white, wealthy, and well-connected students would be an important way to increase USNA's racial and socioeconomic diversity.

2. Athletic Preferences in Boutique Sports

Athletic competition is an important feature of the collegiate landscape, and the two most widely watched collegiate sports, football and basketball, can boost comradery and school spirit.[203] The Army vs. Navy football game is a cherished part of the college experience for many students and alumni and USNA has an interest in fielding a strong team. (Indeed, USNA identified "beat Army and Air Force" as one of its athletic goals.[204]) Moreover, high-profile sports like football and basketball may be economically and racially diverse. At USNA, 55% of men's basketball players between 2023-2027 were Black, and on the football team, 51% were Black, for example.[205] I have no problem with these preferences.

USNA also provides significant preferences, however, for students playing a wide variety of boutique sports such as rowing, sailing, squash, and water polo that do not play the outsized role that football and basketball can contribute to school spirit.[206] Indeed, USNA

---

[202] Chad Coffman, Tara O'Neil, & Brian Starr, "An Empirical Analysis of Legacy Preferences on Alumni Giving at Top Universities," in *Affirmative Action for the Rich*, *supra*, p. 113.
[203] SCACCHoops.com, "Top 5 NCAA sports by viewership, April 16, 2019, https://www.scacchoops.com/top-5-ncaa-sports-by-viewership
[204] USNA-00000543.
[205] Peter Memo 7/12/24. Arcidiacono Report, Appendix H.11
[206] *See* Appendix, Table 5, Simulation 5 for a full listing of boutique sports.

boasts that it supports more varsity sports (36) than nearly any other college in the nation, behind only Ohio State and Stanford.[207] USNA puts an inordinate emphasis on even boutique sports, closely tracking its winning percentages and conference championships between the classes of 2010 and 2023, whether or not there is evidence that other students watch the proceedings.[208]

Admissions for competitive athletes is virtually guaranteed. Recruited athletes, known as "Blue Chip Athletes" in USNA terminology, have a 99.7% probability of admissions in boutique sports, according to Arcidiacono's analysis (so long as they are medically and physically qualified and complete an application.)[209]

Importantly, these boutique sports are often the province of wealthy students who are disproportionately white. At USNA, 70.4% of boutique athletes were white, 9.9% were Hispanic, 8.9% were Asian, and 7.5% were Black. They came from zip codes at the 79th percentile of income on average, and only 1.7% were first-generation college students.[210] Wealthy students are more likely to be able to afford the club travel teams that allow them to fully develop their athletic skills in these sports. USNA could continue to field these teams (as they contribute to the development of students who participate) but it could have explored whether eliminating the large preferences provided in boutique sports would work as a viable race-neutral alternative for increasing racial and socioeconomic diversity without racial preferences.

---

[207] USNA-00024620.
[208] USNA-00000543.
[209] Arcidiacono Report, Appendix H.12.
[210] Arcidiacono Report, Appendix H.13.

3. Preferences for students who attend wealthy high schools or participate in expensive programs.

In addition, USNA awards a number of automatic points in its admissions system for students based on high school or family characteristics that are related to wealth and race and are often beyond the control of an individual student.

To begin with, USNA awards preferences for students who attend a high school with high percentage of students who are college bound. It provides 2,000 WPM points for attending a high school with a 95-100% college going rate; 2,000 points for 95-100% college; 1,500 points for an 85-94% college going rate; 1,000 points for a 75-84% college going rate; 500 points for a 65-74 college going rate; and zero points for going to a high school with a college going rate below 64%.[211]

USNA justifies this approach on the assumption that higher college going rates mean a "higher school quality."[212] But college going rates are merely a reflection of a school's academic competitiveness; the rate is also powerfully influenced by the wealth of students attending the school. In fact, wealthy students in America who have low test scores are *more likely* to graduate from college than are low-income students with high test scores.[213] USNA's system, therefore, effectively rewards students for having parents wealthy enough to live in neighborhoods where high school students go to college at a high rate.

This approach penalizes underrepresented minority students. In 2020, for example, 54% of Black high school graduates went directly to college, compared with 67% of white

---

[211] USNA-00000329.

[212] USNA-00000329.

[213] Robert Putnam, *Our Kids: The American Dream in Crisis* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2015), 190, Figure 4.7.

high school graduates.[214] Because Black students are much more likely than white students to attend high school with large numbers of classmates who are Black, the college going rate of a typical Black student's high school is on average lower.[215] High poverty schools are also more likely to offer fewer than 10 AP classes than more affluent schools.[216]

Similarly, USNA provides automatic WPM points for any applicant who takes a large number of Advanced Placement (AP) classes. Students receive 500 bonus points for taking 10 or more AP classes through the junior year. Likewise, students receive up to 1,000 points for participating in International Baccalaureate classes.[217] This approach has a surface logic because AP classes and IB classes are generally more academically challenging than other courses. A problem arises with this approach, however, because highly capable low-income students—many of them underrepresented minority students—may not even have 10 AP classes offered in their high school. A 2021 study conducted by the Center for American Progress found that 23.3% of the national population attended public high schools where between 0 and 3 AP courses were offered. Another 24.6% attended public high schools where between 4-10 AP classes were offered.[218] Black students were more likely than white students to attend public schools offering 0-3 courses and 4-10 courses.[219]

---

[214] Jon Marcus, "The college-going gap between Black and white Americans was always bad. It's getting worse," *USA Today*, May 15, 2023, https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/education/2023/05/15/college-student-gap-between-black-white-americans-worse/70195689007/.

[215] See GAO, "K-12 Education: Student Population Has Significantly Diversified, but Many Schools Remain Divided Along Racial, Ethnic, and Economic Lines," July 14, 2022, https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-22-104737.

[216] Putnam, *Our Kids*, 168, Figure 4.1.

[217] USNA-00000331.

[218] Roby Chatterji, Neil Campbell, and Abby Quirk, "Closing Advanced Coursework Equity Gaps for All Students," *Center for American Progess*, June 30, 2021, Table 2, https://www.americanprogress.org/article/closing-advanced-coursework-equity-gaps-students/.

[219] Chatteerji, Campbell and Quirk, "Closing Advanced Coursework Equity Gaps," Figure 6.

Taken together, students can receive up to 3,000 bonus points for high school "quality" (measured by their college going peers) and AP classes.[220]   Underrepresented minority, low income, and working-class students can be penalized for each of these measures through no fault of their own.

Other universities have rejected this approach. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, for example, used to provide extra credit in applications for students who took large numbers of AP courses. But when researchers looked at student performance in college, they found the practice was not justified. According to UNC officials: "They found that students who take more AP or IB courses do better in college—but only up to a certain point. If two students have similar SAT scores and high-school grades, and one takes zero AP courses and the other takes five, the student with five AP courses will probably have a higher first-year undergraduate GPA (3.26 versus 3.07). Above five courses, there's no significant increase in GPA."[221]

In the same vein, USNA provides automatic WPM points for extracurricular activities. Some are nominal (5 points for a teaching or laboratory assistant), while some are substantial (860 points for a class president). USNA's WPM guidance lists more than 300 different possibilities for scoring points based on the type of extracurricular activity and level of commitment, so the total number of points available is quite substantial.[222] This approach also has some surface appeal because involvement in extracurricular activities can be a valid indicator of the types of candidates USNA seeks for its student body and officer corps. But

---

[220] USNA-00000331.

[221] Susan Hardy, "More AP Classes May Not be Better: You don't need 10 or 12 APs to get into UNC," *Endeavors*, January 3, 2013, https://endeavors.unc.edu/more_ap_classes_may_not_be_better.

[222] USNA-00001871-879

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

the automatic and mechanical nature of the preference fails to recognize that low-income students are much more likely to attend high school that have few resources for extracurricular activities and that students from these backgrounds are more likely to have to spend time working or providing childcare to help support their families.[223]

USNA continues to employ this practice even though USNA's 2021 "Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan" specifically identified extracurricular activities as a factor in the admissions process which is "directly influenced" by school resources and familial obligations and therefore may be "unintentionally discriminatory against students from underrepresented populations and disadvantaged school districts that do not have the same opportunities for extracurricular activities."[224]

USNA could modify these practices. While it is of course legitimate for colleges to consider the rigor of a high school curriculum and participation in extracurricular activities, USNA engages in highly mechanical practices which penalize underrepresented minority and low-income students for factors beyond their control. It does not, for example, consider AP classes taken and extracurricular participation in the context of opportunities provided. The points are awarded automatically. And, as noted above, USNA's system for rewarding "adversity" does not adequately compensate for all the inequities built into the admissions system. In fact, controlling for academic record and other factors, being low income has a negative effect on a student's odds of admissions.[225]

---

[223] Putnam, *Our Kids*, 174-183.
[224] U.S. Naval Academy, "Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan," March 2021, 5 (found in Exhibit 3 to Latta Declaration).
[225] See earlier discussion.

Modifying such preferences for socioeconomically advantaged students, many of whom are white, could, in combination with other strategies, have a positive effect on racial diversity at USNA.

F.   USNA could seek tweaks to the Congressional appointments process.

An additional race-neutral strategy USNA could pursue would involve seeking to tweak an unusual aspect to USNA's admissions process which evidence shows inhibits diversity: the requirement that the vast majority of students admitted must receive a nomination from a member of Congress.

The Congressional appointment process is written into federal statute, so USNA is not guaranteed to succeed if it seeks any modifications to the process. But as outlined below, USNA itself points to evidence that the process appears to have a racially discriminatory effect, so it is incumbent on USNA to at least to try to seek modest reforms. After all, not all military academies are guided by the Congressional appointments process. The U.S. Coast Guard Academy, for example, is able to recruit candidates directly from the general population, as most American colleges can. Moreover, the Coast Guard has successfully resisted calls for its appointments to be channeled through members of Congress.[226]

By way of background, under the current system, the Congressional appointments process accounts for about 80% of students who are admitted to USNA.[227] Members of Congress nominate a "slate" of up to 10 applicants. USNA has some discretion to choose among these nominations, but in about 35% of cases, members of Congress dictate a top choice (or even a detailed rank sequence of their choices) and USNA typically honors those wishes. The Congressional appointments process, therefore, can override the more

---

[226] Korte and Schouten, "Pride and Patronage."
[227] Latta Declaration, 14.

meritocratic measure USNA employs for admission, such as grades and test scores, that help make up a candidate's WPM score.[228]

Unfortunately, as USNA's Dean Latta himself notes, research shows that Members of Congress "have nominated disproportionately more white students than Black, Hispanic, and Asian and Pacific Islander students."[229] Latta points to a 2021 study by the Connecticut Veterans Legal Center, entitled *Gatekeepers to Opportunity: Racial Disparities in Congressional Nominations to the Military Service Academies*, which found that between 1994-1995 and 2019-2020, only 6% of Congressional nominees were Black (compared with 15% of young people nationally), 8% were Hispanic (compared with 22% of young people nationally), and 74% were white (compared with 54% of young people nationally).[230] The study concluded that the Congressional nominating process "contributed to significant racial and ethnic disparities in the student bodies of the [military] academies."[231]

Arcidiacono's analysis of data from the classes of 2023-2027 likewise finds that those admitted through USNA through the Congressional nominations process were much less likely to be Black, Hispanic, or low income than those who were admitted through other channels not requiring a Congressional nomination.

Overall, Arcidiacono's analysis finds that 87% of admissions went to applicants who had a Congressional nomination. Eighty-three percent came from families making more than $80,000 a year, and 61.3% were white, 14.8% Asian, 12.2% Hispanic, and 7.8% Black. By contrast, the 13% who were admitted without a Congressional nomination were more likely

---

[228] Latta Declaration, 14-15.

[229] Latta Declaration, 41, citing Connecticut Veterans Legal Center, "Gatekeepers to Opportunity: Racial Disparities in Congressional Nominations to the Military Service Academies" 3 (2021), https://perma.cc/85X7-TQ2F; USNA 00006713.

[230] Connecticut Veterans, Gatekeepers, 4-5, 17; USNA-00006714-15, and USNA00006727.

[231] Connecticut Veterans, Gatekeepers, 3; USNA-00006713.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

to be Black and Hispanic and disadvantaged. The data show 41% were white, 28.5% Black, 14.5% Hispanic, 10.8% Asian, and 63.2% came from families making more than $80,000 a year.[232]

Overall, Black students received just 7.83% of the nominations of any sort—Congressional or service related. Hispanics represented just 13.10% of those receiving a nomination.[233] Low-income and first-generation college students are also less likely to receive nominations.[234]

It is not difficult to understand why this might be true. Money is the mother's milk of politics, and members of Congress must devote considerable time to raising millions of dollars on average for re-election. In the 2021-22 cycle, Congressional candidates collected $2.4 billion.[235] Studies show that members of Congress often are more responsive to the interests of those from the top of the socioeconomic strata of the population than those of less advantaged members of society.[236] It is perhaps not surprising, therefore, that Members of Congress nominate very few socioeconomically disadvantaged students, including few first-generation college students. In a 2014 investigation, for example, journalists at *USA Today* reported that Congressional appointments sometimes "go to children of friends, political

---

[232] Arcidiacono Report Appendix H.14.

[233] Arcidiacono Report, Table 3.1.

[234] Arcidiacono Report, Table D.2.

[235] Federal Election Commission, "Statistical Summary of 18-Month Campaign Activity for the 2021-2022 Election Cycle," https://www.fec.gov/updates/statistical-summary-of-18-month-campaign-activity-of-the-2021-2022-election-cycle/.

[236] *See e.g.*, Martin Gilens and Benjamin I. Page, "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens," Perspectives on Politics, September 2104: 564-581 https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/perspectives-on-politics/article/testing-theories-of-american-politics-elites-interest-groups-and-average citizens/62327F513959D0A304D4893B382B992B.

supporters and donors to the lawmakers' campaigns."[237] Historian and former U.S. Army War College dean Lance Betros called the process "a prized currency of patronage, a means of pandering to political favorites."[238]

In addition, the Congressional appointments process, by adding an additional layer of review, also requires applicants to apply much earlier than they do to most other colleges. Many highly selective colleges use an "early admissions" process, which typically requires applicants to apply by November 1, two months in advance of the common regular decision deadline of January 1st.[239] Applicants to USNA and other military academies typically are required to apply by mid-October to late October, essentially requiring every applicant to apply early.[240] In fact, applicants are "encouraged to apply to USNA in the spring of their junior year."[241]

This approach is problematic because research has long found that low-income, working-class and Black and Hispanic students have less access to information from high school counselors and are therefore less likely to apply to colleges on an accelerated timeline. According to a 2011 study by Julie J. Park of Miami University and M. Kevin Eagan of the

---

[237] Gregory Korte and Fredreka Schouten, "Pride and Patronage: How Members of Congress Use a Little-Known Power to Shape the Military and Help Their Constituents," *USA Today*, September 15, 2014 https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2014/09/15/service-academiescongress-nomination-army-navy/15452669/.

[238] Betros, quoted in Korte and Schouten, "Pride and Patronage."

[239] College Board, "Early Decision and Early Action Calendar," https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/plan-for-college/apply-to-college/early-decision-and-early-action-calendar; and Kristen Moon, "Regular Decision Deadlines for Top Universities in 2023-2024, *Forbes*, November 20, 2023, https://www.forbes.com/sites/kristenmoon/2023/11/20/regular-decision-deadlines-for-top-universities-in-2023-24/.

[240] Connecticut Veterans Legal Center, "Gatekeepers to Opportunity: Racial Disparities in Congressional Nominations to the Military Service Academies" 13 (2021), https://perma.cc/85X7-TQ2F; USNA-00006710.

[241] USNA-00004540.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

UCLA Higher Education Research Institute, students who applied early-action to 290 colleges and universities across the country are more economically advantaged and more likely to be white than those who did not apply early.[242] For that very reason, some colleges have moved away from the early admissions process in the wake of the *SFFA v. Harvard* decision because doing so is a race-neutral means of boosting racial diversity.[243]

Rather than seeking to remedy this challenge to racial diversity posed by the Congressional appointments process by shining a light on the issue and educating members of Congress about the importance or making modest reforms to the process, USNA has taken another tack: to apply large racial preferences in admissions. Indeed, Dean Latta cites racial disparities in the Congressional appointments process as "another reason" to resort to racial preferences.[244]

USNA's logic has it backwards. Rather than using racial preferences to "correct" for racial disparities in the Congressional appointment process, it makes much more sense for USNA to use its knowledge of the discriminatory effect to encourage Members of Congress to adopt reforms to address the source of the problem. USNA could seek modest reforms that retain the intent of the Congressional appointment process, while removing the discriminatory effect. The changes would not have to be dramatic in order to capture the many benefits of the current system while avoiding the drawbacks.

---

[242] Julie J. Park & M. Kevin Eagan, "Who Goes Early? A Multi-Level Analysis of Enrolling via Early Action and Early Decision Admissions," *Teachers College Record*, 2011.

[243] *See e.g.*, Liam Knox, "The Common App Enters an Uncommon Era," *Inside Higher Ed*, August 2, 2023 (noting that after the Supreme Court decision, Virginia Tech ended its early decision program); and Scott White, "College Diversity Actions After Supreme Court," *Inside Higher Ed*, November 12, 2023 (noting that following the Supreme Court ruling on racial preferences, Wake Forest decided to allow only first-generation college students to apply early action).

[244] Latta Declaration, 41.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

To begin with, it is important to note that there are several positive aspects of the current process. A central rationale for allocating nominations to each of the nation's congressional districts is to achieve a great deal of geographic diversity among USNA's student body. In addition, in theory, a system which draws from every congressional district in the country should offer the opportunity for racial and socioeconomic diversity. Congressional districts vary dramatically by racial and economic demographics. In 2019, the median income in U.S. Congressional districts ranged widely from about $30,000 to $150,000.[245] In 2022, 136 of 435 U.S. House districts (31%) were majority-minority.[246]

Indeed, states such as Texas, California, and Florida have long used "percentage plans" which admit high achieving students from every high school in their states as a race-neutral way of boosting racial diversity without racial preferences.[247] In the wake of the Supreme Court's 2023 *Students for Fair Admissions* decision, a number of additional state flagships, including the University of South Carolina, the University of Tennessee, and the University of Wisconsin, moved to adopt similar percentage plans.[248] Although USNA draws from a national, rather than statewide, pool of applicants, leading researchers, such as Harvard

---

[245] U.S. Congress, "U.S. Median Household Income Per Congressional District for 117th Congress," https://www.congress.gov/117/meeting/house/114135/documents/HHRG-117-EF00-20211018-SD003.pdf

[246] "Majority-minority districts," Ballotpedia, n.d., https://ballotpedia.org/Majority-minority_districts.

[247] Kahlenberg and Potter, "A Better Affirmative Action," pp. 26-27, 33-34, and 44-45, *supra*.

[248] *See* Doug Lederman, "Admitting the Top 10% for Geographic Diversity" *Inside Higher Ed*, August 2, 2023 (re new South Carolina program; Susan H Greenberg, "University of Tennessee Guarantees Admission to Eligible Students," *Inside Higher Ed*, September 11, 2023, https://www.insidehighered.com/news/quick-takes/2023/09/11/eligible-students-guaranteed-admission-univ-tennessee#:~:text=The%20University%20of%20Tennessee%20Board,according%20to%20a%20system%20statement; and Jessica Blake, "Wisconsin Legislature Approves Guaranteed Admissions Policy," *Inside Higher Ed*, February 15, 2024 https://www.insidehighered.com/news/quick-takes/2024/02/15/wisconsin-legislature-approves-guaranteed-admissions.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

College's Danielle Allen, have proposed that colleges that pull from across the country could customize state percentage plans for their own needs.[249] Allen has described how "[g]eographically based structures for seeking talent are tried and true" and "the pursuit of geographic diversity in admissions is our best hope of merging the goals of diversity and excellence."[250] Indeed, Carnevale's simulation, noted above, finds that a comparable approach—admitting high test scorers within schools—promotes socioeconomic and racial diversity.[251]

Geographic diversity is a very promising approach, so how could the Congressional nominating process be adjusted to attain those benefits without introducing the current system's discriminatory effects? For one thing, USNA could educate Members of Congress on the benefits of adopting a system in which all Congressional slates would be required to include a substantial number of nominees who come from the majority of the population nationally that are first-generation college students. This would create the possibility for greater socioeconomic and racial diversity among nominees. In addition, USNA could educate Members of Congress on the benefits of moving to a system in which all Members give USNA greater discretion over choosing from the slate of nominees. Currently, about 65% of Members recognize that it is important to provide USNA with leeway. USNA might also seek to completely remove the Congressional filter to nominations, but that would likely be seen as too radical.

---

[249] *See* Danielle Allen, "Talent is Everywhere: Using ZIP Codes and Merit to Enhance Diversity," in The Future of Affirmative Action, *supra.*
[250] *Id.* at 147.
[251] Carnevale, Rose, & Strohl, in "Achieving Racial and Economic Diversity with Race-Blind Admissions Policy," *supra.*

Given the discriminatory effects of the current process, which USNA itself points to, USNA could, as a race-neutral strategy, seek modest reforms to the current process rather that doing what it currently does: using discrimination as "another reason" for employing racial preferences.

G. **The Navy could expand its race-neutral strategies through the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC)**

As noted earlier, USNA contends that its interest in achieving a racially diverse class goes beyond the educational benefits of diversity on campus: it also says it has an interest in creating a racially diverse officer corps for the Navy and Marines. But this interest is influenced, of course, by all the pipelines for the officer corps, and race-neutral alternatives can be pursued in these other realms as well.

Those other pipelines are enormous, compared to USNA. According to Dean Latta, 80%-84% of Naval and Marine Corps officers, 72% of war fighting officers, and 60% of flag officers (admirals, vice admirals, and read admirals) come from *outside* of USNA.[252]

While USNA provides 20% of newly commissioned Naval officers, *three times* as many—60%—come through the Reserve Officer Training Corps. ROTC, which dates back to 1819, provides students scholarships to attend universities across the country and the chance to receive military training in return for a commitment to serve in the armed forces after graduation.[253] A November 2006 report identified the Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps (NROTC) "as a source of high-quality officers who have good potential for future advancement in the Marine Corps. The leadership believes that the understanding of the

---

[252] Latta Declaration, 5.
[253] Josh Moody, "What ROTC Programs Are and How They Work," US News & World Report, August 12, 2020, https://www.usnews.com/education/best-colleges/what-rotc-programs-are-and-how-they-work.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

military and Marine Corps culture that midshipmen develop while in the NROTC is particularly important to their future success."[254]

Historically, NROTC has not done a very good job of promoting diversity. Between FY 2016 and FY 2021, 78.9% of NROTC Commissions were white (of any ethnicity), 9.2% were Hispanic, and 5.2% were Black.[255]

The ROTC program could employ a number of race-neutral alternatives outlined above to diversify its population—including socioeconomic preferences, targeted recruitment, and the like. The U.S. military also runs Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) programs in middle and high schools across the country to instill good citizenship. JROTC can often provide a pathway into ROTC. Race-neutral strategies are also possible in this pipeline program. The Connecticut Veterans report, for example, suggests expanding the (JROTC) into more low-income Title I schools. [256]

VI.   Simulations of USNA's data show that workable race-neutral alternatives exist.

Using USNA's data from past years, it is possible to simulate the results of adopting race-neutral strategies and measure the effect of them individually, and then in combination. For each of the simulations, I asked Arcidiacono to replicate as closely as possible USNA's existing system of admissions, using the model he developed that accounts for numerous criteria for admission. In all the simulations, I asked Arcidiacono to "turn off" the advantages associated with race in order to make the admissions process race-neutral. With that preference turned off, admissions probabilities could be generated and the applicants could be ranked in order of strength under the remaining aspects of USNA's admissions process.

---

[254] USNA-00004210.

[255] USNA-00004898.

[256] Connecticut Veterans, Gatekeepers, 34; USNA-00006744.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Because USNA has an unusual process of admissions, I asked Professor Arcidiacono to model simulations with fidelity to USNA's three main avenues for admission.

(1) Every applicant must be nominated, either by a member of Congress or through a "service connected" nomination (e.g., the president and Secretary of Navy, who appoint those with family members in the military) or the Superintendent (who typically appoints Division I athletes).[257] As noted earlier, typically, about 80% of students are admitted through the Congressional appointments process.[258] In this process, applicants compete with other students within their Congressional district rather than against a national pool of applicants. Each member of Congress advances a "slate" of applicants to USNA for consideration by a Slate Review Committee, from which one is typically chosen. Those with the highest WPM do not necessarily win, as Congressional ranking or an applicant's race can factor in.[259]

(2) If applicants lose out in this process, they may nevertheless have another chance for admissions. About 150 students are admitted as "qualified alternates" in which students with the highest WPM are admitted.[260]

(3) Beyond these applicants, a varying number of students (between 255 and 310 in a recent year) may be admitted as "additional appointees." For these appointees, race can count in the process.[261]

Simulation of alternative admissions processes are possible because USNA, as a competitive institution, has many applicants to choose from. In the Class of 2026, for example, it had 12,927 initial applicants, and made 1,390 offers, for 1,184 seats.[262] The process involves

---

[257] Latta Declaration, 13-14, 16-17.
[258] Latta Declaration, 14.
[259] Latta Declaration, 21-23.
[260] Latta Declaration, 23-24.
[261] Latta Declaration, 24.
[262] Class of 2026 Snapshot, https://perma.cc/8PAR-PJUU.

a considerable winnowing of initial applicants. The majority (63%) of initial applicants do not complete their application or withdraw it.[263] Others do not pass the medical and physical requirements, and others do not receive a Congressional or service-related application. Still, after all of this sifting of applicants, USNA has about 3,000 candidates per year to consider for about 1400 spots. This flexibility makes it is possible to simulate what would happen if USNA recalibrated its admission criteria to see whether there is an alternate set of highly capable students who could be admitted using race neutral criteria.

I asked Professor Arcidiacono to test the results of a number of race-neutral options using the admissions data provided by USNA. At my request, he conducted simulations of multiple race-neutral alternatives to forecast the likely outcomes thereof.[264]

These simulations, and the underlying assumptions, are set forth more fully in the charts in Appendix C.[265] I asked Professor Arcidiacono to conduct 14 simulations, using five different race-neutral preference sizes (or boosts), which results in a total of 70 simulations.

---

[263] Arcidiacono Report, Table D.1.

[264] I have worked in the past with researchers such as Anthony Carnevale at Georgetown University to measure the effectiveness of race-neutral alternatives through similar simulations. *See supra* Section IV.C.

[265] Two assumptions underlie all of my simulations. First, if a student is admitted to NAPS in a particular year, that student has an opportunity only in the following year to be admitted to USNA. As I understand it, this complicates the building of models (which is why Professor Arcidiacono models admission to USNA and NAPS separately)—and thus the building of simulations based on those models. To simplify this complexity, my simulations assume that the applicant pool transitioning from prep programs to USNA is in a "steady state"—meaning that the number of applicants to NAPS in a given year (say, Class of 2024) are expected to be equal to the applicants coming from NAPS to USNA in that same year.

Second, there are very few CivPrep and Foundation students relative to the number of NAPS students. As I understand it, there are not enough CivPrep and Foundation students for Professor Arcidiacono to build models of those programs that are nearly as robust and reliable as his models of USNA and NAPS admissions. Accordingly, it is assumed that CivPrep and Foundation students have the same qualifications as NAPS students such that all prep program students are effectively treated as NAPS students in my simulations.

The results are presented as a pooled total for the four years under consideration, and then for each individual year between the classes of 2023 and 2026, making for a grand total of 350 simulation results.

Because students who are admitted to USNA's preparatory programs—the NAPS and Foundation schools—are subsequently admitted to USNA at very high rates, the simulations present the impact of changes in admissions on the non-prep school population, the prep school population, and then the overall population at USNA.

To help understand whether a race-neutral alternative is "workable," I present data on three major indicators: (1) racial and ethnic diversity; (2) socioeconomic diversity; and (3) level of academic preparation.

A.   Under many circumstances, USNA could achieve racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic diversity without sacrificing academic quality.

Below, I outline the steps taken in the 14 simulations. After doing so, I provide an in-depth analysis of two of the 14 simulations, using two different degrees of preference for disadvantaged students (a total of four simulations).

Simulation 1 begins by eliminating racial preferences, both in the admissions to USNA and admissions to NAPS and other preparatory programs. If no race-neutral alternatives are introduced, Black shares decline from 11.5% to 6.9%, Hispanic shares decline from 12.6% to 10.5%, and Asian American admissions decline from 14.0% to 11.5%. White shares increase from 58.0% to 67.4%.[266] Average SAT Math and Verbal scores, and the standardized rank in high school class increase without racial preferences.

---

[266] In reporting the share of racial minorities, Professor Arcidiacono employed a methodology which allocated multiracial students to individual racial groups. See Arcidiacono Report, Appendix G.1.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Simulation 2 builds on Simulation 1, but also provides a preference (of varying sizes depending upon the simulation) to students coming from households making less than $80,000 a year and a separate boost to those who are first-generation college students.[267] Under this simulation, racial and socioeconomic diversity tend to increase and academic preparedness declines modestly.

Because opportunity in America is shaped not only by a student's family socioeconomic status but also the socioeconomic status of a student's neighborhood and school, Simulation 3 builds on Simulation 2 by adding a further admissions boost to students attending public (rather than private) high school, those with a higher share of low-income classmates, and those from zip codes with lower salaries.[268] Students who overcome these odds may show special qualities of grit and determination. Moreover, as noted earlier, because of the nation's history of racial discrimination, Black and Hispanic students of any given income level are on average more likely to face those extra socioeconomic obstacles associated with neighborhood and schools than white students, and therefore would disproportionately benefit from a program that considered those hurdles.[269] Not surprisingly, under this

---

[267] First-generation college is defined as a student whose parents lack a bachelor's degree.

[268] A wide body of research suggests that neighborhood and school have an important impact on a student's academic record, independent of the socioeconomic status of the family. A low-income student who lives in a high poverty neighborhood and attends high poverty public schools faces more obstacles, on average, than a student coming from a household with the same socioeconomic status but lives in a middle class neighborhood and attends a middle class school. *See e.g.*, Raj Chetty and Nathaniel Hendren, "The Impacts of Neighborhoods on Intergenerational Mobility: Childhood Exposure Effects and County-Level Estimates," National Bureau of Economic Research, May 2015, https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/hendren/files/nbhds_paper.pdf.

[269] John R. Logan, Brian D. Stults, and Rachel McKane, "Less Separate, No Less Equal," Brown University, September 27, 2022, https://s4.ad.brown.edu/Projects/Diversity/data/report/report0727.pdf (finding Black middle-income families typically lived in more disadvantaged neighborhoods than low-income white families).

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

simulation, racial and socioeconomic diversity tends to increase and academic preparedness declines modestly.

Simulation 4 builds upon Simulation 3, but also eliminates the legacy preference provided to the family members of USNA graduates. The effects on diversity and academic preparedness are modest. Simulation 5 builds on Simulation 4 and also removes preferences in admissions for students participating in boutique sports (defined as those other than basketball and football). The effects on diversity and academic preparedness vary.

Because Simulations 4 and 5 did not produce substantial changes in the demographics of USNA, and because I want to preserve as much of the USNA admissions process as possible unless it results in increases in diversity, the remaining simulations restore the legacy preference and the preference for boutique sports.[270]

Simulation 6 builds on Simulation 3 (bypassing Simulations 4 and 5) and removes the preferences USNA provides to socioeconomically advantaged students for whom large numbers of classmates are college bound, have access to large numbers of AP classes, and participate in a host of extracurricular activities that are much more likely to be provided in affluent schools. This simulation also provides a boost to students who are college bound even though few of their classmates are bound for college. Compared with Simulation 3, this simulation generally results in higher levels of racial and socioeconomic diversity and modest declines in academic preparedness.

Simulation 7 (whose results I will explain in greater detail below), builds on Simulation 6 and shows the results of what would happen if USNA also reserved the NAPS program for

---

[270] There are substantial reasons why USNA might wish to eliminate legacy preferences apart from their effect on racial diversity. *See* Kahlenberg, *Affirmative Action for the Rich, supra.* But this exercise is more strictly focused on race-neutral strategies to produce racial diversity.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

two groups of students: the current allocation of student athletes (Blue Chip Athletes), with the remainder of seats going to students who come from families making less than $80,000 a year.[271]

The rationale for this simulation is that once racial preferences are removed to admissions to NAPS, it is appropriate to devote slots in a developmental program to economically disadvantaged students—those who are least likely to have had a chance to develop their talents fully in high school. Under this simulation, racial and socioeconomic diversity generally rises compared with Simulation 6 and academic preparedness remains strong.

Simulation 8 builds on Simulation 7 but also envisions USNA doubling the number of seats devoted to NAPS graduates.[272] Because NAPS has been an important source of diversity and graduates have been graduating from USNA at relatively high levels, expansion of a NAPS program based on socioeconomic disadvantage could offer important benefits to USNA. Compared to Simulation 7, Simulation 8 generally results in an increase in racial and socioeconomic diversity and academic preparedness declines modestly.

Because Simulation 8 involves a structural change to the size of the NAPS program, Simulation 9 builds instead on Simulation 7 and restores NAPS to its original size. In Simulation 9, USNA invests greater resources in recruitment of underrepresented minority students, such that the URM applicant pool of those with completed application increases by

---

[271] NAPS supplies roughly 200 students to USNA in a typical year, of which about 60 are Blue Chip Athletes. See Arcidiacono Report, Appendix H.8.

[272] As Shown in Appendix, Table 8, Simulation 8 would see the total number of USNA students admitted from NAPS rise from 1264 over 5 years (an average of 253 per year) to 2528 over five years (or about 506 per year). The share of the total class during that time period (6906) coming from NAPS would rise from 18.3% to 36.6%.

50%.[273] This scenario is reasonable given evidence presented above about USNA's failure to invest in recruitment strategies that USNA admissions officers have indicated are effective. The USNA admissions office has repeatedly pointed to programs that can increase completed applications by URM candidates and has expressed continued frustration that the Navy has not provided the resources necessary to expand recruitment. Also, as noted above, the Coast Guard Academy was very successful in promoting racial diversity by increasing its outreach to URM candidates (without providing a racial preference). Compared with Simulation 7, Simulation 9 generally shows a marked increase in racial diversity, a modest increase in socioeconomic diversity, and only a modest effect on academic preparedness. (I will provide more detailed information about the results of Simulation 9 below.)

The remaining simulations (Simulation 10-14) provide variations on Simulation 9. Simulation 10 shows what would happen if USNA invested increasing recruitment of URM applicants by 100%; Simulation 11 models a 200% increase in USNA applications; Simulation 12 a 50% increase in low-income applicants; Simulation 13 a 100% increase in low-income applicants; and Simulation 14 a 200% increase in low-income applicants. Compared with Simulation 7, these approaches—none of which employ racial preferences in decision making—result in increases in racial and socioeconomic diversity, with modest effects on academic preparedness.

As noted above, the 14 simulations are run with five differently sized preferences for socioeconomically disadvantaged students, providing a total of 70 different results. The sizes of socioeconomic preferences are described in relationship to the size of the preference

---

[273] Given that we do not have access to data on what the expanded pool might look like, the expanded pool scenarios simulate the effect of an expanded pool that would contain students with characteristics identical to USNA's current socioeconomically disadvantaged pool.

currently provided by USNA to Black students. They are: (1) 0.50x the Black boost; (2) 0.75x the Black boost; (3) 1.0x the Black boost; (4) 1.25x the Black boost; and (5) 1.50x the Black boost.[274]

Admissions boosts for socioeconomically disadvantaged students are wholly appropriate given the obstacles they have overcome in life, so long as they are academically prepared to do the work at USNA. After all, USNA is very comfortable with providing admissions preferences in other contexts, particularly minority students and Blue Chip athletes.

In the classes of 2023-2027, a 157-point combined SAT gap existed between admitted Black and admitted white students at USNA.[275] At the same time, USNA says minority students have performed well. In a 2022 memorandum, USNA officials said "minority students have succeeded at USNA. Over the past several years, minority students have graduated at about 87%, which is roughly on par with the overall class graduation rates."[276]

---

[274] Students can receive multiple socioeconomic boosts: a full size boost for coming from a low income household, another full size boost for being a first-generation college student; a half size boost for attending a public high school; a half size boost for being from a low income zip code; a half size boost for going to a high poverty high school; and a half size boost for having a low proportion of students in one's high school who attend a four year college. As a result, for example, a student qualifying for all of the 0.50 boosts would receive boosts of 0.50 + 0.50 +0.25 + 0.25+0.25 +0.25, for a total boost of 2.0x the boost provided by USNA to Black students.

[275] Arcidiacono Expert Report, Table 3.14. Admitted Black students had an average math SAT of 602 and verbal SAT of 609 for a combined score of 1211. Admitted white students had an average math SAT of 684 and an average verbal SAT of 684 for a combined score of 1368.

[276] Latta, Appendix Exhibit 4, November 9, 2022 Memo, 80 of 89. *See also* USNA-00000527 (a December 2019 Institutional Effectiveness report finds that for the class of 2019, "the minority graduation rate (88.9%) was the highest in USNA history," and each subgroup "graduates at rates exceeding 83%." The overall graduation rate was 90.2%).

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Arcidiacono also finds that Blue Chip athletes also have lower SAT scores and high school GPA than other admitted students.[277] Yet USNA continues to put a major emphasis on recruiting such athletes.

Indeed, under the current system, USNA has chosen to admit students with a wide variety of WPM and SAT scores. Though not confirmed independently, data provided by USNA shows that one student was admitted with a WPM of 39,351.[278] This would place that admitted student at the 1st percentile.[279] USNA has testified that even the lowest scoring students are qualified for admissions. Dean Latta declared: "USNA does not offer appointment to unqualified candidates."[280]

Below I present the more detailed results for Simulations 7 and 9, using the smallest socioeconomic preference (0.50x the Black boost); and the largest socioeconomic preference (1.50x the Black boost). The other three sizes of preferences fall between these two.

1. Simulation 7 with a 0.50x Black Boost for Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students.

---

[277] In Appendix H.11 of his report, Arcidiacono shows that Blue Chip Athletes have average SAT math scores of 615 compared to 685 for non-BCA's. The corresponding SAT verbal scores are 722 and 680. The Standardized Class Rank measures are 471 and 599, which corresponds to a GPA gap of about 0.5 grade points on a 4-point scale.

[278] See Arcidiacono Report, Appendix H.15.

[279] USNA-00001866

[280] Latta Declaration, 29. More generally, it cannot be said that USNA limits itself solely to academic superstars. Between the classes of 2014-2023, the percentage of students who failed to make the top 10% of their high school class fluctuated from 30% to 50%. USNA-00000535. It is true that USNA puts a special emphasis on math and science. USNA requires all students to take courses in science, engineering, and navigation as part of their studies, Latta Declaration, 4. USNA "commissions no less than 65 percent STEM majors into the Navy." Latta, Appendix, 60 of 80, November 6, 2017 document. But USNA does not have a higher bar for math SAT scores than verbal scores. In fact, incoming math and verbal SAT scores are identical for the middle 50% of the population: 610-720 for verbal, and 610-720 for math. *See* Class of 2026 Snapshot, https://perma.cc/8PAR-PJUU.

The results of simulation 7 with a 0.50x socioeconomic boost are presented below (see Table 2). As noted above, this simulation ends preferences based on race, provides preferences for students from socioeconomically disadvantaged families, schools, and neighborhoods, eliminates unfair preferences for students from wealthy schools, and reserves non-athlete NAPS slots for students from low-income families.

Table 2: Simulation 7 – 0.50x Boost USNA – Admitted Class of 2023-2026 (Pooled)			
Status Quo Race-Based Admissions		Simulation Race-Neutral Admissions	
White	58.0%	White	64.5%
Black	11.5%	Black	7.7%
Hispanic	12.6%	Hispanic	12.0%
Asian American	14.0%	Asian American	12.2%
Native Am./Hawaiian	2.6%	Native Am./Hawaiian	2.2%
Minority population	40.7%	Minority population	34.1%
HH Income Below $80,000	18.8%	HH Income Below $80,000	31.3%
SAT (V +M) SAT Total SAT Percentile	673+671 1344 89/90th	SAT V+M SAT Total SAT Percentile	672 + 669 1341 89/90th
High School Rank in Class (GPA)	585.0 4.05/4.06	High School Rank in Class (GPA)	587.0 4.06/4.07

Under this simulation, minority representation declines (from 40.7% to 34.1%), socioeconomic diversity increases (from 18.8% to 31.3%), and academic preparation levels remain very high. SAT percentiles remain identical, and high school GPA actually increases slightly.

In assessing the overall impact on diversity, USNA officials themselves have emphasized that *both* socioeconomic and racial diversity matter. One official noted: "An officer corps from diverse backgrounds and educational environments provides a broader range of perspectives, experience, and knowledge, which amplifies innovative thought and drives innovative solutions to the complex issues the armed forces encounter in warfighting and

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

defending our national security."[281] In that regard, a modest drop in racial diversity must be weighed in tandem with the rise in socioeconomic diversity.

Moreover, to put the 34.1% minority representation that would result under the simulation in historical context, at USNA the minority share of the student body was just 17% in the class of 1997 and 24% in the class of 2002.[282]

2.   Simulation 7 1.50x Boost

Table 3 presents the results for the same Simulation (7) where the boost for socioeconomically disadvantaged students is dialed up to 1.50x the boost currently provided to Black students. The larger size of the preference is reasonable given extensive evidence which finds that in identifying students who have overcome obstacles and may show more promise than their raw credentials suggest, socioeconomic disadvantage is far more important than race. In one study, for example, Georgetown professors Anthony Carnevale and Jeff Strohl found that in estimating predicted SAT scores, socioeconomically disadvantaged students score on average 399 points below socioeconomically advantaged students, while for African American students, the expected score that is explained by racial rather than socioeconomic disadvantage is 56 points lower than white students.[283] President Barack Obama noted this reality when he declared that his socioeconomically advantaged daughters

---

[281] *See* Vazirani Decl. ¶19. *See also Grutter*, 539 U.S. 306, 324 (2003); *Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265, 316 (1978). USNA says that diversity by socioeconomic status is a "trigger" that calls for special attention to an applicant by the 24-member Board of Admissions. *See* Latta Declaration, 7-9.

[282] Latta Declaration, 28. *See also* USNA-00000528 (The Class of 2023's minority representation was 39.8%, "the highest in USNA history" and slightly higher than minority applicant pool of 38.5%); and USNA-00021350 and USNA-00021393 (showing rise of minority admissions over time).

[283] *See, e.g.*, Anthony P. Carnevale & Jeff Strohl, "How Increasing College Access Is Increasing Inequality, and What To Do About It," in Rewarding Strivers 170, Table 3.7 (Century Foundation, 2010), p. 170, Table 3.7.

did not deserve a preference but economically disadvantaged students of all races did.[284] Moreover, as William Bowen, the former President of Princeton University, has noted, SAT scores do not over-predict the college grades of low-income students as they do those of Black students.[285]

The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Simulation 7 – 1.50x Boost USNA – Admitted Class of 2023-2026 (Pooled)			
Status Quo Race-Based Admissions		Simulation Race-Neutral Admissions	
White	58.0%	White	62.2%
Black	11.5%	Black	8.7%
Hispanic	12.6%	Hispanic	13.4%
Asian American	14.0%	Asian American	12.1%
Native Am./Hawaiian	2.6%	Native Am./Hawaiian	2.3%
Minority population	40.7%	Minority population	36.5%
HH Income Below $80,000	18.8%	HH Income Below $80,000	40.0%
SAT (V +M) SAT Total SAT Percentile	673 + 671 1344 89/90th	SAT V+M SAT Total SAT Percentile	662 + 661 1323 87/88th
High School Rank in Class (GPA)	585.0 4.05/4.06	High School Rank in Class (GPA)	575.1 4.01/4.02

Compared with Simulation 7 with the 0.50x boost, the 1.50x boost produces higher levels of racial and socioeconomic diversity. Overall minority representation rises to 36.5%, and the representation of students from families making less than $80,000 a year rises to 40.0%. Given the doubling of students from lower income households (from 18.8% to

---

[284] Rachel Swarns, "For Obama, a delicate path on race and class," *New York Times*, August 3, 2008, https://www.nytimes.com/2008/08/03/world/americas/03iht-obama.1.14965389.html.

[285] Bowen, Kurzweil, & Tobin, Equity and Excellence in Higher Education, *supra*, p. 118 (SAT's do not over-predict college grade point average for low-income students); and William Bowen and Derek Bok, The Shape of the River, p. 77 (SAT's over-predict college grade point average for African American students).

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

40.0%), enlarging the share of those who faced extra disadvantages, this cohort remains very impressive academically. Academic preparedness remains strong, as average SAT scores decline just two percentile points, and High School GPA declines just four-one hundredths of a grade point.

3. Simulation 9 0.25x Boost

Table 4 presents the results of the next simulation: Simulation 9 with a 0.25x boost. Simulation 9, as noted above, is the same as Simulation 7 with a 0.25 boost, but it also envisions USNA doing more to invest in recruitment of underrepresented minority students so that the URM applicant pool increases by 50%.[286] As discussed earlier, a 50% increase in applicants is reasonable given the record of the Coast Guard Academy in increasing recruitment, and the ample evidence that the USNA admissions office desires to do much more to recruit URM students using programs that have proven highly effective but have been starved of resources.[287]

---

[286] Underrepresented minority students are defined in the simulation as Black, Hispanic, or Native American/Hawaiian.
[287] *See* discussion Section V.C supra.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Table 4: Simulation 9 – 0.25x Boost USNA – Admitted Class of 2023-2026 (Pooled)			
Status Quo Race-Based Admissions		Simulation Race-Neutral Admissions	
White	58.0%	White	59.8%
Black	11.5%	Black	9.0%
Hispanic	12.6%	Hispanic	15.8%
Asian American	14.0%	Asian American	11.2%
Native Am. /Hawaiian	2.6%	Native Am./Hawaiian	2.8%
Minority population	40.7%	Minority population	38.3%
HH Income Below $80,000	18.8%	HH Income Below $80,000	32.3%
SAT (V +M) SAT Total SAT Percentile	673 + 671 1344 89/90th	SAT V+M SAT Total SAT Percentile	670 + 668 1338 88/89th
High School Rank in Class GPA	585.0 4.05/4.06	High School Rank in Class GPA	587.0 4.06/4.07

The results of this simulation are very successful. Without using racial preferences, USNA could enjoy almost as much minority representation (38.3%) as it does using racial preferences (40.7%).   Socioeconomic diversity increases substantially. And academic preparation levels remain high, with average SAT scores falling by only one percentage point, and high school GPA rising slightly.

4.   Simulation 9 1.50x Boost

Table 5 presents the results of the final simulation I will highlight. It is the same as the previous simulation presented (Simulation 9) but with a 1.50x boost, rather than a 0.25 boost, for socioeconomically disadvantaged students.

Table 5: Simulation 9 – 1.50x Boost USNA – Admitted Class of 2023-2026 (Pooled)			
Status Quo Race-Based Admissions		Simulation Race-Neutral Admissions	
White	58.0%	White	56.7%
Black	11.5%	Black	10.4%
Hispanic	12.6%	Hispanic	17.7%
Asian American	14.0%	Asian American	11.1%
Native Am./Hawaiian	2.6%	Native Am./Hawaiian	2.9%
Minority population	40.7%	Minority population	42.1%
HH Income Below $80,000	18.8%	HH Income Below $80,000	42.6%
SAT (V +M) SAT Total SAT Percentile	673 + 671 1344 89/90th	SAT V+M SAT Total SAT Percentile	658 + 657 1315 87th
High School Rank in Class GPA	585.0 4.05/4.06	High School Rank in Class GPA	573.5 4.01/4.02

Simulation 9 with a 1.50x boost produces remarkable levels of diversity without racial preferences. Overall minority representation actually increases from the status quo (40.7%) to 42.1% under the simulation. Underrepresented minorities (Black, Hispanic, and Native American/Hawaiian students) do particularly well. Black shares rise above 10%, and Hispanic and Native American shares are higher than under the current system of racial preferences. Socioeconomic diversity more than doubles, and yet despite the influx of students who have faced extra obstacles, the academic quality of the institution remains remarkably strong with a combined SAT of 1315 and a GPA of 4.01/4.02. For historical context, in 2010, the average Verbal SAT was about 635 and the average Math SAT was 660 for a combined SAT of about 1295.[288]

B.   The simulations provide a floor rather than a ceiling on how much racial and socioeconomic diversity USNA could achieve. Taking additional steps could predict even greater racial and ethnic diversity.

The simulations outlined above underestimate the potential of USNA to employ race-neutral alternatives. In part because of data limitations, the simulations presented were unable

---

[288] USNA-00025968,

to employ several of the effective race-neutral strategies discussed in Section V above that have been shown to provide high levels of racial and socioeconomic diversity, coupled with strong levels of academic preparation. I outline seven particular limitations below.

1. Socioeconomic preferences using wealth data. In running the simulations, Arcidiacono and I did not have access to USNA data on the wealth of applicants. As discussed earlier, these data have enormous implications for the racial dividend of socioeconomic preferences. While Black Americans make roughly 60% of what white people make in annual income, the median wealth of Black Americans is just 10% the median wealth of Whites.[289] If we had access to wealth data of applicants, it is extremely likely that racial diversity numbers would have increased.

2. Socioeconomic preferences using single parent household data. The simulation also did not include whether a student comes from a single parent household. USNA does collect data on whether or not a student lives in a single parent household but Professor Arcidiacono concluded that the data were unreliable. As a result, it was not prudent to model a preference for students who had overcome the disadvantage associated with growing up in a single parent household. Simulating a preference for students from single family households would have helped USNA better identify talent (because such students have overcome odds), and would also have disproportionately helped Black and Hispanic students, as noted above.

3. Socioeconomic preferences using granular income data. The simulations outlined above had to rely on limited data about family income. Ideally, a socioeconomic preference would recognize that students from very low-income families face larger obstacles

---

[289] *See* Dalton Conley, *supra.*

than those from working-class families. But the simulation that Arcidiacono ran on my instructions instead had to rely on two very crude income categories: households making more or less than $80,000 a year. This was unfortunate. As noted above, USNA collects granular data on applicants in several bands: (1) below $20,000; (2) $20,000-$40,000; (3) $40,000-$60,000; (4) $60,00-$80,000; and (5) above $80,000. However, Professor Arcidiacono concluded that because there were so few applicants and admits in the first four categories ($80,000 and below), he could not create a reliable simulation which would, as I'd hoped, provide preferences on a sliding scale. (I would, for example, have liked to simulate a bigger boost, to students from families making below $20,000 than those coming from families making between $60,000-$80,000.) Having additional reliable data would likely have had a positive effect on racial diversity. Providing a uniform preference for all students coming from families making below $80,000, disproportionately benefits Black and Hispanic students, but a larger preference from very low-income students who almost surely have had an even more pronounced impact on improving racial diversity because Black and Hispanic students are especially likely to be found among very low-income families.

4. Socioeconomic preferences using neighborhood Block Group Census Tracts not zip codes. The simulation also underestimates the potential for socioeconomic preferences to produce racial diversity because USNA refused to provide SFFA with the street address of applicants. Having street addresses would have allowed Arcidiacono to pinpoint the neighborhood a student lives in to the Block Group Census tract, which typically has between 600 and 3,000 people.[290] USNA instead provided Arcidiacono with zip codes, which

---

[290] United States Census Bureau, "Glossary," https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/geography/about/glossary.html.

typically contain about 10,000 people, and can have more than 100,000.[291] Because zip codes encompass larger swaths of populations, they are more likely to encompass affluent and low income populations and cross racial lines than are Block Group Census tracts. As a result, they are less targeted toward identifying students who face extra disadvantages, and are also likely to miss the ways in which Black and Hispanic students are, on average, disadvantaged by living in neighborhoods with concentrated poverty.

5. Increasing the share of enlisted service members. The simulations also do not tell us what additional racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic diversity might be achieved if USNA increased its share of enlisted members. Enlisted members are more diverse than the officer corps. If enlisted members constituted, for instance, not 5% of the entering class, but 15%, 20%, 25%, or 30%, what additional diversity might be possible? The data provided by USNA did not allow us to simulate these scenarios.

6. Tweaking the Congressional appointments process. In addition, the simulations underestimate the extent of racial, ethnic and socioeconomic diversity that may be possible with race neutral alternatives because the data provided by USNA did not allow us to measure the effect of tweaking the current system of Congressional appointments—which USNA itself describes as discriminatory, with a less discriminatory approach. What, for example, would happen if members of Congress were required to submit a meaningful share of nominees who come from first-generation college backgrounds? What would happen if USNA successfully persuaded Congress to give greater latitude in the 35% of cases when Congressional appointments are dictated by members? The data shared by USNA does not

---

[291]   Proximity   One,   "Zip   Code   General   Demographic   Characteristics" https://proximityone.com/zip16dp1.htm.

allow us to know, in part because USNA does not track which applicants reach out to which Congressional offices for appointments.

7. The effect of race-neutral strategies in ROTC. Finally, the simulations underestimate the potential of achieving a more diverse corps of Navy officers because they do not include the potential benefits of ROTC's adoption of a number of new race-neutral strategies that could boost racial diversity.

The simulations, by themselves, show that USNA could achieve its diversity goals without the use of race. But as these additional strategies suggest, the estimates provide a bare minimum of what could be achieved; and the actual level of diversity could very well be much greater.

VII.   Conclusion

USNA bears "the ultimate burden of demonstrating, before turning to racial classifications, that available, workable race-neutral alternatives do not suffice."[292] Experience and research demonstrate that there are numerous ways that universities can achieve the benefits of racial and socioeconomic diversity without using race. USNA has failed to take even the most rudimentary steps to determine whether there are workable race-neutral strategies available. Moreover, a careful investigation of USNA's admissions data and practices confirms that USNA has at its disposal viable race-neutral alternatives that would provide a net increase in racial and socioeconomic diversity that maintain high academic standards without resorting to racial preferences.

Dated: July 15, 2024   /s/ Richard D. Kahlenberg

Richard D. Kahlenberg

---

[292] *Fisher v. University of Texas*, 570 U.S. 297, 312 (2013).

Appendix A: CV of Richard Kahlenberg

RICHARD D. KAHLENBERG
www.richardkahlenberg.org

EDUCATION

1986-1989	**Harvard Law School,** Cambridge, Massachusetts. J.D., *cum laude*, June 1989.
1985-1986	**University of Nairobi School of Journalism**, Nairobi, Kenya. Certificate, Mass Communications, June 1986. Rotary International Fellowship.
1981-1985	**Harvard College**, Cambridge, Massachusetts. A.B. in Government, *magna cum laude*, June 1985. Senior Honors Thesis "Coalition Building and Robert Kennedy's 1968 Presidential Campaign"

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

2024-	**Progressive Policy Institute**, Washington DC Director, American Identity Project on how to teach students what it means to be an American. Director, Housing Policy, focused on making housing less expensive and less segregated.
2021-	**George Washington University Trachtenberg School of Public Policy & Public Administration**, Washington D.C. Professorial Lecturer. Teaching class on "Civil Rights and Economic Inequality."
2022-2024 DC	**Georgetown University McCourt School of Public Policy**, Washington, DC Non-Resident Scholar. Focused on reducing inequality in education.
1998- 2022	**The Century Foundation**, Washington, D.C. Senior Fellow and Director of K-12 Equity. Focused on promoting social mobility and social cohesion in America by strengthening elementary, secondary and higher education, organized labor and housing opportunities.
1996-1998	**Center for National Policy**, Washington, D.C. Fellow. Coordinated project on New Strategies to Promote Equal Opportunity.
1994-1995	**Professorial Lecturer and Independent Writer**, Washington, D.C. Taught Cases in Public Policy, George Washington University Department of Public Administration and completed book on affirmative action.

1993-1994   **George Washington University National Law Center,** Washington, D.C.
               Visiting Associate Professor of Law. Taught Constitutional Law.

1989-1993   **Senator Charles S. Robb**, Washington, D.C.
               Legislative Assistant. Advised Senator on issues relating to Crime, Energy,
               Environment, Judicial Appointments, Campaign Finance, and Civil Rights.

PUBLICATIONS AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

I. BOOKS

Class Matters: The Fight to Get Beyond Race Preferences, Reduce Inequality, and Build Real Diversity at America's Colleges **(Public Affairs Books, Forthcoming 2025).** The book outlines a better future for affirmative action that supports low-income and working-class students of all races.

Excluded: How Snob Zoning, NIMBYism and Class Bias Build the Walls We Don't See. (Public Affairs Books, 2023). Robert Putnam called the book "brilliant," Ruy Teixeira "profound," and Congressman Emanuel Cleaver, "exquisite." *Publishers Week* said the book is "a valuable guide to fixing one of America's most enduring social ills," and *Kirkus Review* called it, "provocative" and "thoughtful." The book won the 2023 Goddard Riverside Book Prize for Social Justice.

A Smarter Charter: Finding What Works for Charter Schools and Public Education (coauthored with Halley Potter) (Teachers College Columbia University Press, 2014). *The Washington Post* called *A Smarter Charter*, "A remarkable new book...Wise and energetic advocates such as Kahlenberg and Potter can take the charter movement in new and useful directions."

Why Labor Organizing Should Be a Civil Right: Rebuilding a Middle-Class Democracy by Enhancing Worker Voice (coauthored with Moshe Z. Marvit) (Century Foundation Press, 2012). The book was called "a must read" by NAACP President and CEO Benjamin Todd Jealous and "a persuasive roadmap for extending the protections of the Civil Rights Act to workers who want to organize a union" by American Federation of Teachers President Randi Weingarten.

Tough Liberal: Albert Shanker and the Battles Over Schools, Unions, Race and Democracy (Columbia University Press, 2007). The Wall Street Journal called the book "a well researched and engaging biography," and Slate labeled it a "stirring account." The book has also been reviewed in The Nation, The American Prospect, The Weekly Standard, Newsday, New York Sun, City Journal, Publishers Weekly, and The Washington Monthly. The book was written with the support of the Hewlett, Broad and Fordham foundations. It was named one of the Five Best Books on Labor in the Wall Street Journal

All Together Now: Creating Middle Class Schools through Public School Choice (Brookings Institution Press, 2001). The book, labeled "a clarion call for the socioeconomic desegregation of U.S. public schools" by Harvard Educational Review, was said by the Washington Post to make "a substantial contribution to a national conversation" on education. The book was also

reviewed in Teachers College Record, Education Next, and National Journal. One author called Kahlenberg "the intellectual father of the economic integration movement."

The Remedy: Class, Race, and Affirmative Action (Basic Books, 1996). The book was named one of the best of the year by the Washington Post and William Julius Wilson's review in the New York Times called it "by far the most comprehensive and thoughtful argument thus far for...affirmative action based on class." The book was also reviewed in The American Lawyer, The New Yorker, The Progressive, The Washington Monthly, The Detroit News, National Review, Legal Times, The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, and Publishers Weekly

Broken Contract: A Memoir of Harvard Law School (Hill & Wang/Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1992). The book, which details the way in which idealistic liberal law students are turned to corporate law, was called "a forceful cri de coeur" by the L.A. Times. The book was reviewed in The New York Times, The Washington Post Book World, The Harvard Law Review, The Washington Monthly, Legal Times, The Boston Globe, The Hartford Courant, The Baltimore Evening Sun, The St. Petersburg Times, The Detroit News, The Cleveland Plain Dealer, The Dallas Morning News, and Publishers Weekly. In 1999, the book was reissued by University of Massachusetts Press with a new afterword. The book has also been translated into Japanese and Chinese.

Executive Director (and primary author and editor), ***Restoring the American Dream: Providing Community Colleges with the Resources They Need. The Report of the Century Foundation Working Group on Community College Financial Resources*** (Century Foundation Press, 2019). The Working Group included Thomas Bailey, Bruce Baker, Brooks Bowden, Anthony P. Carnevale, Debbie Cochran, Michelle Cooper, Russ Deaton, Wil Del Pilar, David Deming, Sara Goldrick-Rab, Harry Holzer, Tammy Kolbe, Jesse Levin, Bridge Terry Long, Tatiana Melguizo, Gail Mellow, Andrew Nichols, George Pernsteiner, Ken Redd, Jennifer Rice and Robert Toutkoushian. In addition, the volume included background papers by Bruce Baker and Jesse Levin; Anthony P. Carnevale, Artem Gulish, and Jeff Strohl; and Richard D. Kahlenberg, Robert Shireman, Kimberly Quick and Tariq Habash.

Editor, ***The Future of Affirmative Action: New Paths to Higher Education Diversity after Fisher v. University of Texas*** (Century Foundation Press, 2014). Chapters include, "Defining the Stakes," by Nancy Cantor and Peter Englot; "Promoting Economic Diversity for College Affordability," by Sara Goldrick-Rab; "Fisher v. University of Texas and Its Practical Implications for Institutions of Higher Education," by Arthur L. Coleman and Teresa E. Taylor; "New Rules for Affirmative Action in Higher Education," by Scott Greytak; "Transitioning to Race-Neutral Admissions," by Halley Potter; "Striving for Neutrality," by Marta Tienda; "The Use of Socioeconomic Affirmative Action at the University of California," by Richard Sander; "Converging Perils to College Access for Racial Minorities," by Richard L. McCormick; "Ensuring Diversity Under Race-Neutral Admissions at the University of Georgia," by Nancy G. McDuff and Halley Potter; "Addressing Undermatch," by Alexandria Walton Radford and Jessica Howell; "Talent is Everywhere," by Danielle Allen; "Reducing Reliance on Testing to Promote Diversity," by John Brittain and Benjamin Landy; 'Advancing College Access with Class-Based Affirmative Action," by Matthew N. Gaertner; "Achieving Racial and Economic Diversity with Race-Blind Admissions Policy," by Anthony P. Carnevale, Stephen J. Rose, and Jeff Strohl; "The Why, What, and How of Class-Based

Admissions Policy," by Dalton Conley; "A Collective Path Upward," by Richard Sander; and "Increasing Socioeconomic Diversity in American Higher Education," by Catharine Hill.

Executive Director (and primary author and editor), *Bridging the Higher Education Divide: Strengthening Community Colleges and Restoring the American Dream. The Report of the Century Foundation Task Force on Preventing Community Colleges from Becoming Separate and Unequal.* (Century Foundation Press, 2013.) The task force on community colleges, cochaired by Anthony Marx and Eduardo Padron, included John Brittain, Walter Bumphus, Michele Cahill, Louis Caldera, Patrick Callan, Nancy Cantor, Samuel Cargile, Anthony Carnevale, Michelle Asha Cooper, Sara Goldrick-Rab, Jerome Karabel, Catherine Koshland, Felix Matos Rodriguez, Gail Mellow, Arthur Rothkopf, Sandra Schroeder, Louis Soares, Suzanne Walsh, Ronald Williams, and Joshua Wyner. In addition, the volume included background papers by Sandy Baum and Charles Kurose; Sara Goldrick-Rab and Peter Kinsley; and Tatiana Melguizo and Holly Kosiewicz.

Editor, *The Future of School Integration: Socioeconomic Diversity as an Education Reform Strategy* (Century Foundation Press, 2012). Chapters include, "Housing Policy is School Policy: Economically Integrative Housing Promotes Academic Success in Montgomery County, Maryland," by Heather Schwartz; "Socioeconomic Diversity and Early Learning: The Missing Link in Policy for High-Quality Preschools," by Jeanne L. Reid; "The Cost-Effectiveness of Socioeconomic School Integration," by Marco Basile; "The Challenge of High-Poverty Schools: How Feasible is Socioeconomic School Integration?" by An Mantil, Anne G. Perkins, and Stephanie Aberger; "Can NCLB Choice Work? Modeling the Effects of Interdistrict Choice on Student Access to Higher-Performing Schools," by Meredith P. Richards, Kori J. Stroub, and Jennifer Jellison Holme; "The Politics of Maintaining Balanced Schools: An Examination of Three Districts," by Sheneka M. Williams; and "Turnaround and Charter Schools that Work: Moving Beyond Separate but Equal," by Richard Kahlenberg.

Editor, *Affirmative Action for the Rich: Legacy Preferences in College Admissions* (Century Foundation Press, 2010). Chapters include "Legacy Preferences in a Democratic Republic," by Michael Lind; "A History of Legacy Preferences," by Peter Schmidt; "An Analytical Survey of Legacy Preferences," by Daniel Golden; "An Empirical Analysis of the Impact of Legacy Preferences on Alumni Giving at Top Universities," by Chad Coffman, Tara O'Neil and Brian Starr; "Admitting the Truth: The Effect of Affirmative Action, Legacy Preferences, and the Meritocratic Ideal on Students of Color in College Admissions," by John Brittain and Eric Bloom; "Legacy Preferences and the Constitutional Prohibition of Titles of Nobility," by Carlton Larson; "Heirs of the American Experiment: A Legal Challenge to Preferences as a Violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Constitution and the Civil Rights Act of 1866," by Steve Shadowen and Sozi Tulante; "Privilege Paving the Way for Privilege: How Judges Will Confront the Legal Ramifications of Legacy Admissions to Public and Private Universities," by Boyce F. Martin Jr. with Donya Khalili; and "The Political Economy of Legacy Admissions, Taxpayer Subsidies, and Excess 'Profits' in American Higher Education: Strategies for Reform," by Peter Sacks.

Editor, *Rewarding Strivers: Helping Low-Income Students Succeed in College* (Century Foundation Press, 2010). Chapters include: "The Carolina Covenant," by Edward B. Fiske, and "How Increasing College Access is Increasing Inequality and What to do About It," by Anthony P. Carnevale and Jeff Strohl. William Fitzsimmons called the book part of Century's

"trailblazing mission to prevent the tragic waste of human talent that threatens America's future," while Anthony Marx declared, "Kahlenberg again gathers the best thinkers on how to challenge this status quo; what to do, what works, and what does not."

Editor, *Improving on No Child Left Behind: Getting Education Reform Back on Track* (Century Foundation Press, 2008). Chapters include: an analysis of the under-funding of the No Child Left Behind Act, by William Duncombe, John Yinger and Anna Lukemeyer; a discussion of the rights of students in low performing schools to transfer to better performing public schools across district lines, by Amy Stuart Wells and Jennifer Holme; and an exploration of how to improve the accountability provisions of the act, by Lauren Resnick, Mary Kay Stein, and Sarah Coon. Diane Ravitch called *Improving on No Child Left Behind* "the best of the books on this topic."

Editor, *America's Untapped Resource: Low-Income Students in Higher Education* (Century Foundation Press, 2004). The chapters include: "Socioeconomic Status, Race/Ethnicity, and Selective College Admissions," Anthony P. Carnevale and Stephen J. Rose; "Improving the Academic Preparation and Performance of Low-Income Students in American Higher Education," by P. Michael Timpane and Arthur M. Hauptman; and "Low-Income Students and the Affordability of Higher Education," by Lawrence E. Gladieux. Carnevale and Rose's finding, that 74% of students at selective colleges come from the top socioeconomic quartile and 3% from the bottom quartile is widely cited.

Editor, *Public School Choice vs. Private School Vouchers* **(**Century Foundation Press, 2003). The volume consists of a compilation of new and previously published materials, including articles by Edward B. Fiske, Helen F. Ladd, Sean F. Reardon, John T. Yun, Amy Stuart Wells, Richard Just, Ruy Teixeira, Thad Hall, Gordon MacInnes, Richard C. Leone, and Bernard Wasow.

Executive Director (and primary author and editor), *Divided We Fail: Coming Together Through Public School Choice. The Report of The Century Foundation Task Force on the Common School,* (Century Foundation Press, 2002). The task force on school integration, chaired by Lowell Weicker, included Joseph Aguerrebere, Ramon Cortines, Robert Crain, John Degnan, Peter Edelman, Christopher Edley, Kim Elliott, Jennifer Hochschild, Helen Ladd, Marianne Engelman Lado, Leonard Lieberman, Ann Majestic, Dennis Parker, Felipe Reinoso, Charles S. Robb, David Rusk, James Ryan, Judi Sikes, John Brooks Slaughter, Dick Swantz, William Trent, Adam Urbanski, Amy Stuart Wells, and Charles V. Willie. In addition, the volume included background papers by Duncan Chaplin, David Rusk, Edward B. Fiske, William H. Freivogel, Richard Mial, and Todd Silberman.

Editor, *A Notion at Risk: Preserving Public Education as an Engine for Social Mobility* (Century Foundation Press, 2000). The book identifies individual sources of inequality and proposes concrete public policy remedies. The chapters include: "Summer Learning and Home Environment" by Doris Entwisle, Karl Alexander and Linda Olson of Johns Hopkins; "Equalizing Education Resources for Advantaged and Disadvantaged Children" by Richard Rothstein of the Economic Policy Institute; "High Standards: A Strategy for Equalizing Opportunities to Learn?" by Adam Gamoran of the University of Wisconsin; "Inequality in Teaching and Schooling: Supporting High-Quality Teaching and Leadership in Low Income Schools" by Linda Darling-Hammond and Laura Post of Stanford; "Charter Schools and

Racial and Social Class Segregation: Yet Another Sorting Machine?" by Amy Stuart Wells, Jennifer Jellison Holme, Alejandra Lopez, and Camille Wilson Cooper of UCLA; "Student Discipline and Academic Achievement" by Paul Barton of the Educational Testing Service; and "Critical Support: The Public View of Public Education," by Ruy Teixeira of the Century Foundation

II. BOOK CHAPTERS

"The Impact of Class, Legacy, Status, and Wealth in Higher Education Law and Policy: Combatting Disadvantages in a Culture that Celebrates Advancement and Merit," in Peter F. Lake (ed), *Oxford Handbook of U.S. Higher Education Law*, (Oxford University Press, forthcoming.)

"Make labor organizing a civil right," (with Moshe Marvit), in Richard Bales and Charlotte Garden (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of U.S. Labor Law for the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge University Press, 2019).

"The Bipartisan, and Unfounded, Assault on Teachers' Unions," in Michael B. Katz and Mike Rose (eds.), *Public Education Under Siege* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.)

"Socioeconomic Integration and Segregation," in James A. Banks (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Diversity in Education* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2012).

"Socioeconomic School Integration: Preliminary Lessons from More than 80 Districts," in Erica Frankenberg and Elizabeth DeBray-Pelot (eds.), *Integrating Schools in a Challenging Society: New Policy and Legal Options for a Multiracial Generation*, (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 2011)

"Combating School Segregation in the United States," in Guido Walraven, Dorothee Peters, Eddie Denessen and Joep Bakker (eds.), *International Perspectives on Countering School Segregation* (Dutch National Knowledge Centre for Mixed Schools, 2010).

"Levelling the School Playing Field: A Critical Aim for New York's Future," in Jonathan P. Hicks and Dan Morris (eds.), *From Disaster to Diversity: What's Next for New York City's Economy?* (New York: Drum Major Institute, 2009).

"Higher Education Access," in RobertMcKinnon (ed), *Actions Speak Loudest* (Guilford, CT: Globe Pequot Press, 2009)

"Socioeconomic School Integration," in Marybeth Shinn and Hirokazu Yoshikawa (eds), *Toward Positive Youth Development: Transforming Schools and Community Programs* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

"The History of Collective Bargaining Among Teachers," in Jane Hannaway and Andrew J. Rotherham (eds) *Collective Bargaining in Education: Negotiating Change in Today's Schools* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2006).

"Socioeconomic School Integration: A Symposium," in Chester Hartman (ed), *Poverty and Race in America: The Emerging Agendas* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield, Publishers, 2006).

"The Return of 'Separate but Equal,'" in James Lardner and David Smith (eds), *Inequality Maters: The Growing Divide in America and Its Poisonous Consequences* (New York: New Press, 2005).

"Economic School Integration," in Stephen J. Caldas and Carl L. Bankston III (eds), *The End of Desegregation?* (New York: Nova Science Publishers Inc., 2003).

"President Clinton's Race Initiative: Promise and Disappointment," and "How to Achieve One America: Class, Race, and the Future of Politics," in Stanley A. Renshon (ed), *One America? Political Leadership, National Identity and the Dilemmas of Diversity* (Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 2001).

III. LAW REVIEW ARTICLES

"New Avenues for Diversity After *Students for Fair Admissions*," 48 *Journal of College and University Law* 283 (December 2023).

"'Architects of Democracy': Labor Organizing as a Civil Right," (with Moshe Marvit) 9 *Stanford Journal of Civil Rights & Civil Liberties* 213 (June 2013).

"Reflections on Richard Sander's Class in American Legal Education," 88 *Denver University Law Review* 719 (September 2011).

"Socioeconomic School Integration," 85 *North Carolina Law Review* 1545 (June 2007).

"Remarks: Symposium – Brown v. Board of Education at Fifty: Have We Achieved Its Goals?" 78 *St. John's Law Review* 295 (Spring 2004).

"Socioeconomic School Integration Through Public School Choice: A Progressive Alternative to Vouchers," *45 Howard Law Journal* 247 (Winter 2002).

"Class-Based Affirmative Action," 84 *California Law Review* 1037 (July 1996).   .
"Getting Beyond Racial Preferences: The Class-Based Compromise," 45 *American University Law Review* 721 (February 1996).

IV. PERIODICAL ARTICLES

Have written hundreds of articles in the popular press for the American Educator, American Prospect, American School Board Journal, Atlantic, Baltimore Sun, Boston Globe, Boston Review, Chicago Sun Times, Christian Science Monitor, Chronicle of Higher Education, Civil Rights Journal, Education Next, Education Week, Educational Leadership, Forward, Inside Higher Education, Jurist, Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, Journal of Commerce, Legal Affairs, Legal Times, New Labor Forum, Nation, New Republic, New York Daily News, New York Times, Orlando Sentinel, Philadelphia Inquirer, Political Science Quarterly, Poverty and Race, Principal Magazine, Slate, Wall Street Journal, Washington Monthly, Washington Post and Wilson Quarterly.

V. ACADEMIC/PUBLIC POLICY APPEARENCES

Have spoken before hundreds of audiences in numerous settings: government (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights; U.S. Department of Education); academic associations (American Educational Research Association; Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management); colleges and universities (American, Amherst, Centre, Columbia, Flagler, George Washington, Georgetown, Harvard, Howard, Marymount, Middlebury, Missouri Western, National Defense University, New York University, Oberlin, Pitzer, Rutgers, St. Johns, St. Louis, Stanford, Stetson, Suffolk, University of Chicago, University of Maine, University of Maryland, University of North Carolina, University of Pennsylvania, University of Richmond, University of Southern California, University of Virginia, West Chester, William and Mary, Yale); and public policy forums (American Association of Community Colleges, American Enterprise Institute, Brookings Institution, Cato Institute, Center for American Progress, Chautauqua Institution, College Board, Committee for Economic Development, Council for Opportunity in Education, Economic Policy Institute, Demos, Education Law Association, Education Sector, Ethics and Public Policy Center, Fordham Institute, Hechinger Institute, KnowledgeWorks Foundation, National Academy of Sciences Board on Testing and Assessment, National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, National Council of Educational Opportunity, New America Foundation, New York Historical Society, New York Public Library, Pioneer Institute, Progressive Policy Institute, William T. Grant Foundation, and Woodrow Wilson Center).

VI. AWARDS

William A. Kaplin Award for Excellence in Higher Education Law and Policy Scholarship, Stetson Law School National Conference on Law & Higher Education (2013).

Goddard Riverside Book Prize for Social Justice (for *Excluded: How Snob Zoning, NIMBYism and Class Bias Build the Walls We Don't See*) (2023)

VII. EXPERIENCE CONSULTING WITH SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Hunter College High School (New York City) (2021-2022). Helped selective high school diversify its student population.

Los Angeles Unified School District (2020-21). Served as a pro bono member of LAUSD Equitable Enrollment Collaborative Group.

New York City Public Schools. (2018-2019). Served as a pro bono member of the Executive Committee of the New York City Department of Education's School Diversity Advisory Group, appointed by Mayor Bill de Blasio and chaired by Maya Wiley.

Groton Public Schools (Connecticut) (2018-2020) Helped school district implement a socioeconomic diversity plan.

District Five of Lexington and Richland Counties (South Carolina) (2018). Helped school district implement a socioeconomic diversity plan for magnet schools.

New Haven Public Schools (Connecticut) (2017).   Helped school district implement a socioeconomic diversity plan for magnet schools.

Pasadena Public Schools (California) (2017).   Helped school district implement a socioeconomic diversity plan for magnet schools. Also prepared reports for the Pasadena Educational Foundation recommending adoption of socioeconomic diversity policies (2006 and 2016).

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools (North Carolina) (2016).   Helped school district create a socioeconomic school diversity plan.

Chicago Public Schools (Illinois) (2008-2010). Helped school district create a socioeconomic school integration plan for magnet and selective enrollment schools.

VIII. EXPERT TESTIMONY IN FEDERAL COURTS

Students for Fair Admissions v. University of North Carolina (2020). Testified in U.S. Federal District Court about the availability of using socioeconomic preferences and other race-neutral alternatives to produce racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic diversity.

Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard (2018). Testified in U.S. Federal District Court about the availability of using socioeconomic preferences and other race-neutral alternatives to produce racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic diversity.

United States v. Board of Education of Chicago (2009). Testified in U.S. Federal District Court about the use of socioeconomic indicators as a way or promoting racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic diversity in Chicago Public Schools selective enrollment and magnet schools.

IX. GRANTS

Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (2022-2023) $475,000 grant in support of research on the connection between exclusionary zoning and educational opportunities in the state of New York.

Walton Family Foundation (2019-2022) $1.3 million grant in support of research on school and housing integration and the creation of the Bridges Collaborative, a first-ever hub for 57 school districts, charter schools and housing organizations committed to integration.

Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (2019-2022) $405,000 grant in support of Bridges Collaborative and disseminating research about diverse by design charter schools.

Walton Family Foundation (2017-2019) $500,000 grant in support of research on diverse-by-design charter schools.

William T. Grant Foundation (2016-2019) $350,000 grant in support of a working group on community college finances that culminated in the publication of *Restoring the American Dream:*

Providing Community Colleges with the Resources They Need. The Report of the Century Foundation Working Group on Community College Financial Resources (Century Foundation Press, 2019).

Lumina Foundation (2013-2014) $50,000 and $40,000 grants in support of research and dissemination of research on ways to promote socioeconomic, racial and ethnic diversity in selective colleges in light of legal constraints that culminated in the publication of *The Future of Affirmative Action: New Paths to Higher Education Diversity after Fisher v. University of Texas* (Century Foundation Press, 2014).

Ford Foundation (2011-2013) $240,000 grant in support of creation of a task force on community colleges (chaired by Anthony Marx and Eduardo Padron) that culminated in the publication of *Bridging the Higher Education Divide: Strengthening Community Colleges and Restoring the American Dream. The Report of the Century Foundation Task Force on Preventing Community Colleges from Becoming Separate and Unequal.* (Century Foundation Press, 2013.)

Nellie Mae Educational Foundation (2005-2006) $50,000 grant in support of research on the use of socioeconomic status in admissions to advance racial, ethnic and socioeconomic diversity at selective colleges that culminated in the publication of *Rewarding Strivers: Helping Low-Income Students Succeed in College* (Century Foundation Press, 2010).

Broad Foundation (2003-2007) $100,000 grant in support of research and writing about the life of teach union leader Albert Shanker that culminated in the publication of *Tough Liberal: Albert Shanker and the Battles Over Schools, Race, Unions and Democracy* (Columbia University Press, 2007).

Hewlett Foundation (2003-2007) $100,000 grant in support of research and writing about the life of teach union leader Albert Shanker that culminated in the publication of *Tough Liberal: Albert Shanker and the Battles Over Schools, Race, Unions and Democracy* (Columbia University Press, 2007).

Fordham Foundation (2005) $10,000 grant in support of research and writing about the life of teach union leader Albert Shanker that culminated in the publication of *Tough Liberal: Albert Shanker and the Battles Over Schools, Race, Unions and Democracy* (Columbia University Press, 2007).

Spencer Foundation (2000-2002) $50,000 grant in support of research for a Century Foundation Task Force (chaired by Governor Lowell Weicker) on combatting school segregation that culminated in publication of *Divided We Fail: Coming Together Through Public School Choice. The Report of The Century Foundation Task Force on the Common School*, (Century Foundation Press, 2002).

Spencer Foundation (1996-1998) $25,000 grant in support of research and writing about socioeconomic school integration, that culminated in publication of *All Together Now: Creating Middle-Class Schools through Public School Choice* (Brookings Institution Press, 2001).

X. ADVISORY BOARD SERVICE

Albert Shanker Institute, Washington D.C.

Pell Institute, Washington D.C.

National Coalition on School Diversity Research Advisory Board, Washington D.C.

*   *   *

Appendix B: Publications

4/3/95   Author, "Class, Not Race: A Liberal Case for Junking Old-Style Affirmative Action in Favor of Something that Works," The New Republic (cover story).

7/17/95   Author, "Affirmative Action by Class," Washington Post, A19

7/17/95   Author, "Equal Opportunity Critics: Class vs. race, round 2," New Republic.

2/96   Author, "Getting Beyond Racial Preferences: The Class-Based Compromise," American University Law Review.

6/2/96   Author, "Bob Dole's Colorblind Injustice: On Affirmative Action, He Caves to Big Business," Outlook Section, *Washington Post.*

7/96   Author, "Class-Based Affirmative Action," *California Law Review.*

8/23/96   Author, "The Sound of Affirmative Action," The Forward.

9/13/96   Author, "Dishonest Defenders of Racial Preferences," *Wall Street Journal.*

10/7/96   Author, "Goal Line," (re Jack Kemp and affirmative action), *The New Republic.*

11/4/96   Author, "Need-based affirmative action," *Christian Science Monitor.*

12/96   Author, "Defend It, Don't Mend It: Clinton's affirmative action man has little bad to say about racial preferences," *The Washington Monthly.*

12/2/96   Author, "A Sensible Approach to Affirmative Action," *The Washington Post.* [

4/20/97   Author, "Need-based affirmative action in the spotlight," Orlando Sentinel.

1/19/98   Author, "Affirmative Action? Yes: But let's base it on need rather than on race," Philadelphia Inquirer.

Spring '98   Author, "Class-Based Affirmative Action: A Natural for Labor," New Labor Forum.

6/98   Author, "In Search of Fairness: A Better Way," *The Washington Monthly.*

11/98   Author, "Style, not Substance," *The Washington Monthly,* pp. 45-48.

1/19/99   Author, "Class-based affirmative action," *The Boston Globe.*

9/21/99   Author, "The Colleges, the Poor, And the SATs" *Washington Post*, A19.
7-8/00   Author, "Class Action: The good and the bad alternatives to affirmative action," *The Washington Monthly*, 39-43.

9/15/01   Author, "President Clinton's Racial Initiative: Promise and Disappointment," (Chapter 4); and "How to Achieve One America: Class, Race, and the Future of Politics,"

(Chapter 11), in Stanley A. Renshon (ed) *One America? Political Leadership, National Identity, and the Dilemmas of Diversity* (Georgetown University Press)

Spring/02   Author, Review of John David Skrentny "Color Lines," *Political Science Quarterly*, pp. 144-145.

9/9/03   Author, "The Conservative victory in Grutter and Gratz," *Jurist* (symposium with Derick Bell, Peter Schuck, Susan Low Bloch and others).

1/14/04   Author, "Q&A: Low-income college students are increasingly left behind," *USA Today*, p.7D.

3/19/04   Author, "Toward Affirmative Action for Economic Diversity," *Chronicle of Higher Education.*
5/05   Author, "Class Action: Why education needs quotas for poor kids," *Washington Monthly*

11/10/06   Author, "Time for a New Strategy," [re the Michigan affirmative action vote] *Inside Higher Education.*

3/07   Author, "Invisible Men: Race is no longer the unacknowledged dividing line in America. Class Is," *The Washington Monthly.*

2/4/08   Author, "Obama's RFK Moment: he could win over working class whites," *Slate.*

5/12/08   Author, "Barack Obama and Affirmative Action," *Inside Higher Education.*

5/23/08   Author, "A touch of class" (Obama and affirmative action), *Guardian America.*

11/6/08   Author, "What's Next for Affirmative Action?" *The Atlantic.*

9/30/09   Author, "The Next Step in Affirmative Action: Class-based systems can skirt court and ballot defeats – and do a better job of addressing socioeconomic diversity" *Washington Monthly Online.* [Referenced in Steve Benen, "Political Animal," *Washington Monthly.Com* 9/30/09]

12/16/09   Author (along with Julian Bond, Lee Bollinger, Jamie Merisotis and others), "Reactions: Is It Time for Class-Based Affirmative Action?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

3/3/10   Author, "Disadvantages," [review of Thomas Espenshade and Alexandria Walton Radford, No Longer Separate, Not Yet Equal], *New Republic.*

4/2/10   Author, "The Affirmative Action Trap," *The American Prospect*

5/23/10   Author, "Five myths about college admissions," Outlook Section, The *Washington Post*, p. B3 [

5/30/10   Author, "Toward a New Affirmative action," *Chronicle of Higher Education Review.*

6/10/10   Author, "A Response to the Critics of Class-Based Affirmative Action," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

6/18/10   Author, "Rewarding Strivers," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

7/7/10   Author, "The French Twist on Affirmative Action," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

7/20/10   Author, "Ross Douthat, White Anxiety and Diversity," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

7/28/10   Author, "Next Week's Court Hearing on Affirmative Action," Innovations Blog, *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

9/17/10   Author, "Colorado's Affirmative Action Experiment," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

9/22/10   Author, "10 Myths about Legacy Preferences in College Admissions," *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

9/24/10   Author, "A Response to Supporters of Legacy Preferences," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

11/3/10   Author, "Arizona's Affirmative Action Ban," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

11/22/10   Author, "New Ways to Achieve Diversity in California," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

11/24/10   Author, "South Africa's Affirmative Action Debate," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

11/29/10   Author, "Does it Matter Where You Go to College? Numbers Favor Top Schools," Room for Debate, *The New York Times.*

12/10/10   Author, "Oxford's Research-Based Affirmative Action," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

1/6/11   Author, "Do Legacy Preferences Count More than Race?" Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

1/27/11   Author, "The Next Big Affirmative-Action Case," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

2/11/11   Author, "Nick Clegg's Attack on Social Segregation in Higher Education," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

3/3/11   Author, "Are Legacy Preferences 'Defensible Corruption?'" Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

3/10/11   Author, "Who Benefits Most from Attending Top Colleges?" Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

4/5/11   Author, "The 'Reverse Discrimination Sentiment,'" Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.* [cited in "Attitudes Toward Access to Higher Education Affected by Race, Study Shows," *Huffington Post*, 4/6/11]

4/29/11   Author, "The Decline of Legacy Admissions at Yale," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

5/11/11   Author, "Purchasing Seats at Top British Universities," Innovations Blog, *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

5/26/11   Author, "Restoring LBJ's Original Vision of Affirmative Action," Innovations Blog, *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

6/21/11   Author, "Is Affirmative Action Headed Back to the Supreme Court?" Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

7/5/11   Author, "Steps Forward and Back on Affirmative Action, Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

8/4/11   Author, "Achieving Racial Diversity Without Using Race," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

8/17/11   Author, "Race, Class and the New ACT Results," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

9/13/11   Author, "An Affirmative Action Success," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

9/27/11   Author, "Reflections on Richard Sander's Class in American Legal Education," *Denver University Law Review.*

9/28/11   Author, "Economic Segregation in American Law Schools," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

10/3/11   Author, "The First Monday in October," [re Fisher v. Texas], Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

10/17/11   Author, "A Third Path on Affirmative Action?" Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

11/2/11   Author, "The Amicus Briefs on Affirmative Action," Innovations Blog. Chronicle of Higher Education [re Sander and Taylor brief]

11/13/11   Author, "Affirmative Action for the Rich," (with Stephen Joel Trachtenberg, John Brittain, Peter Sacks, Michele Hernandez, Terry Shepard and Debra Thomas), "Why Do Top Schools Still Take Legacy Applicants?" Room For Debate Blog, *New York Times.*

11/17/11   Author, "Legacy Preferences at Private Universities," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

11/21/11   Author, "What Should Obama Do on Affirmative Action?" Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

11/29/11   Author, "The Days of Legacy Admissions May be Numbered," *Minding the Campus* Blog.

12/5/11   Author, "Obama's New Guidance on Diversity," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education*

1/8/12   Author, "The Broader Significance of Fisher v. Texas," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

2/9/12   Author, "Waiting on Fisher v. Texas," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

2/21/12   Author, "Fisher v. Texas: How Obama Should Talk About Affirmative Action," *Slate.*

2/22/12   Author, "Will the Supreme Court Kill Diversity?" Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

3/29/12   Author, "Three Myths about Affirmative Action," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

4/20/12   Author, "Does the Texas Top-10%-Plan Work?" Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

5/10/12   Author, "A Bad Week for Elizabeth Warren - and Affirmative Action," *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

5/29/12   Author, "Overturning or Modifying 'Grutter v. Bollinger'?" Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

6/1/12   Author, "Asian Americans and Affirmative Action," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.* [cited in Asian American Educational Foundation, 6/4/12

6/25/12   Author, "Should Colleges Consider Legacies in the Admissions Process? No: It Hurts the Deserving," (debate with Stephen Joel Trachtenberg), *Wall Street Journal.*

7/11/12   Author, "Transparency About Legacy Preferences," (re MIT), Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

8/8/12   Author, "The University of Texas's Weak Affirmative-Action Defense," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education*.8/10/12Author,   "President   Obama's Affirmative Action Problem and What He Should Do About It," *The New Republic*.

8/16/12   Author, "Obama's Affirmative-Action Brief," Innovations Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education*

9/4/12   Author, "Fisher Symposium: Race-neutral alternatives work," *SCOTUSblog*.

9/11/12   Author, "In defense of race-neutral alternative jurisprudence," Fisher Symposium, *SCOTUSblog*,
9/17/12   Author, "3 views on whether US still needs affirmative action: A middle way - Use affirmative action to help economically disadvantaged students of all races," *Christian Science Monitor*.

10/3/12   Author (with Halley Potter), "A Better Affirmative Action: State Universities that Created Alternatives to Racial Preferences," The Century Foundation.

10/3/12   Author, "A New Kind of Affirmative Action Can Ensure Diversity," *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

10/10/12   Author, "A Liberal Critique of Racial Preferences," *Wall Street Journal*, A17.

10/10/12   Author, "The Race to the Flop – The Problem with Affirmative Action," *The New Republic*.

10/11/12   Author, "The Achilles Heel of Affirmative Action," Conversation Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education*

10/22/12   Author, "Diversity or Discretion? Essay questions motives of U. Of Texas in affirmative action case," *Inside Higher Education*.

11/7/12   Author, "Another Nail in Affirmative Action's Coffin," The Conversation Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

11/9/12   Author, "Economic Affirmative Action," *The Washington Post*, A27. [
12/13/12   Author, "Supreme Court Double Header: The Arguments for Gay Marriage Undermine Affirmative Action," *Slate*.

12/19/12   Author (with John Brittain), "When Wealth Trumps Merit," in Room for Debate (along with Ron Unz, S.B. Woo and others), "Fears of an Asian Quota in the Ivy League," *New York Times*.

1/17/13   Author, "Where Sotomayor and Thomas Agree on Affirmative Action," Conversation Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

3/12/13   Author, "Presidents in denial on use of race-based admissions preferences," *Inside Higher Ed*.

3/19/13   Author, "The Untapped Pool of Low-Income Strivers," The Conversation Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

5/13/13   Author, "Addressing the Economic Divide," in "Diversity Without Affirmative Action?" Room for Debate (with Patricia Williams, Richard Vedder, Marta Tienda, and John Brittain), *New York Times.*

6/2/13   Author, "End race-based affirmative action? Yes: Class matters much more," *New York Daily News.*

6/24/13   Author, "The Next Affirmative Action? Universities Should Respond to the Supreme Court Ruling by Giving a Bigger Admissions Boost to Low-Income Students," *Slate.*

6/24/13   Author, "A new affirmative action based on class," *USA Today.*

6/25/13   Author, "The Class-Based Future of Affirmative Action," *The American Prospect.*

6/26/13   Author, "Why Everyone Is Wrong about *Fisher vs. University of Texas,*" *Washington Monthly*9/2/13   Author, "A Refreshingly Honest Book About Affirmative Action," *The New Republic.*

9/27/13   Author, "The Misleading Administrative Guidance on Affirmative Action," *Chronicle of Higher Education.* [

10/14/13   Author, "A Fresh Chance to Rein in Racial Preferences: The Supreme Court's Fisher decision last spring has been largely ignored. Now the justices can strengthen it." *Wall Street Journal,* A15.

11/21/13   Author, "In defense of proxies," (symposium with Sigal Alon, John Skrentny and others), *Contexts: American Sociological Associatio*n, Fall 2013.

3/11/14   Author, "No Longer Black and White: Why Liberals Should Let California's Affirmative Action Ban Stand," *Slate.*

4/10/14   Author, "Good News for Low-Income Students: A campaign to challenge racial-preference policies at three universities should move higher education toward affirmative action based on class," Conversation Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

4/22/14   Author, "Did the Supreme Court Just Kill Affirmative Action? No. But it's clearly on its deathbed. That might not be such a bad thing," *Politico.*

4/27/14   Author, "Affirmative Action Fail: The Achievement Gap By Income is Twice the Gap by Race," *The New Republic.*

4/27/14   Coauthor (with Halley Potter), "Focus on Class Instead," in Room for Debate, "Should Affirmative Action Be Based on Income?" *New York Times.*

6/17/14   Author, "What Sotomayor Gets Wrong About Affirmative Action," *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

7/17/14   Author, "Affirmative-Action Ruling Could Be Pyrrhic Victory for UT-Austin," *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

9/12/14   Author (with Peter Dreier), "Making Top Colleges Less Aristocratic and More Meritocratic," The Upshot Section, *The New York Times.*

11/20/14   Author, "Achieving College Diversity Without Discriminating by Race," *Wall Street Journal*, p. A17.

12/2/14   Author, "Why Labor Should Support Class-Based Affirmative Action," New Labor Forum; and "Richard D. Kahlenberg Responds" (to Julie Park), New Labor Forum.

2/13/15   Author, "Affirmative Action for the Advantaged at UT-Austin," The Conversation Blog, *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

5/18/15   Author, "For the Sake of Working-Class Students, Give 'Fisher' Another Chance," *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

6/4/15   Author, "Race-Based Admissions: The Right Goal, but the Wrong Policy" (re LBJ 50th anniversary of affirmative action), *The Atlantic.*

7/23/15   Author, "How a New Report May Hasten the End of Racial Preferences in Admissions," *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

12/8/15   Author, "Texas' college admissions policies give the well-to-do a leg up," *Los Angeles Times.*

12/8/15   Author, "The Future of Affirmative Action: How a conservative decision at the Supreme Court could lead to a liberal outcome," *The Atlantic.*

12/11/15   Author, "Right-wing judge for working-class kids: In praise of Samuel Alito's stand on affirmative action in higher education," *New York Daily News.*

12/14/15   Author, "Scalia's Rant and Alito's Reasoning: What will influence Anthony Kennedy and determine the fate of affirmative action in Fisher?" *Slate.*

12/24/15   Author (with Anthony Carnevale and Jeff Strohl) "Should Race Be a Factor in College Admissions?" Letter to Editor (re Sigal Alon oped), *New York Times*, A18.

1/11/16   Coauthor (with Jennifer Giancola), "True Merit: Ensuring Our Brightest Students Have Access to Our Best Colleges and Universities, Jack Kent Cooke Foundation.

3/14/16   Author, "Racial Diversity Without Racial Preferences: The growing case for class-based affirmative action in college admissions,", *Washington Monthly.*

6/23/16   Author, "A win for wealthy students," Fisher II Symposium, *Scotusblog.*

7/1/16   Author, "How the Legal Victory on Affirmative Action Undermines the Progressive Coalition: The University of Texas' policies make it harder to build an enduring cross-racial class-based coalition in American politics," *The Washington Monthly.*

1/4/17   Author, "How to Protect Diversity During Trump's Presidency: Liberals should expand the concept to include socioeconomic status," *The New Republic.*

4/14/17   Author, "Harvard's Class Gap: Can the academy understand Donald Trump's 'forgotten' Americans?" Harvard Magazine, May-June 2017, 35-39. [

8/3/17   Author, "The right fix to affirmative action: Progressives should answer the President's apparent plans with their own reforms" *New York Daily News.*

11/16/17   Author, "Should affirmative action be based on income instead of race? Yes" (debate with Richard Rothstein), *Congressional Quarterly Researcher*, p. 985.

2/14/18   Author, "When Affirmative Action Benefits the Wealthy: First-generation student groups are protesting admissions practices that privilege the relatives of   alumni   – even though their own families could one day benefit," *The Atlantic.*

6/22/18   Author, "A Better Way to Diversity Harvard: The university favors the rich and overuses racial preferences in admission. Here's how the school should approach diversity instead," *Slate.*

9/4/18   Author, "Affirmative action should be based on class, not race," *The Economist*

10/12/18   Author, "We still need affirmative action – just not by race," *Boston Globe.*

11/12/18   Author, "Harvard Has a Choice on Diversity – and It's Not About Race," *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

3/21/19   Author (with Alan Morrison), "Admissions Policies Lack Credibility. The Cure: Radical Transparency," *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

5/25/19   Author, "An Imperfect SAT Adversity Score is Better than Just Ignoring Adversity," *The Atlantic.*

10/3/19   Author, "There's a better way to diversify Harvard," *Boston Globe.*

9/16/20   Author, "A Path Forward on Reparations," [Review of William Darity and Kirsten Mullin, *From Here to Equality], Democracy Journal, Fall 2020.*

10/26/22   Author, "The Affirmative Action That Colleges Really Need: Universities want to protect the status quo because it's easy for them.," *The Atlantic.*

10/27/22   Author, "A New affirmative action should be based on class," *Boston Globe.*

10/31/22   Author, "Consider class, not race, in college admissions," *New York Daily News.*

11/9/22   Coauthor (with John Brittain), "10 Ways Colleges Can Diversity After Affirmative Action: There are many options beyond racial preferences," *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

2/8/23 Co-author (with Peter Dreier and Melvin L. Oliver), "Wealth: The Last Path to Diversity at College After SCOTUS Strikes Down Affirmative Action," *Slate.*

3/21/23   Author, "A Middle Ground on Race and College," *National Affairs.*

3/23/23   Author, "A New Path to Diversity" *Dissent.*

6/6/23   Author, "What Biden Should Do About Affirmative Action," *Liberal Patriot.*

7/5/23   Author, "How to Fix College Admissions Now: Focus on Class, Not Race," *New York Times.*

2/16/24   Author, "New Avenues for Diversity After *Students for Fair Admissions*," *Journal of College and University Law*, v. 48. No. 2 (December 2023), 283-324.

2/22/24   Author, "Alito's Furious Dissent in a New Admissions Case Is a Good Sign For Student Body Diversity," *Slate.*

3/5/24   Author, "A Harvard Champion of Affirmative Action Accepts Reality," [review of Derek Bok, Attacking the Elites], *Washington Monthly.*

3/19/24   Author, "What to Look for in the Upcoming Release of Harvard's Diversity Numbers," *Harvard Crimson.*

4/2/24   Author, "In Harvard's Admissions Decisions, Signs of Progress but Some Data Missing," *Harvard Crimson*

Appendix C: Documents Relied Upon or Considered in Forming Opinions

In addition to the academic literature cited above, I considered the following facts and data specific to this case:

- Verified complaint, Doc 1
- Defendants' Memorandum in Opposition to Motion for Preliminary Injunction, Doc 46
- Latta Declaration, Doc 46-2
- Exhibit B, Doc 46-3
- Exhibit C, Doc 46-4
- Exhibit D, Doc 46-5
- Exhibit E, Doc 46-6
- Exhibit F, Doc 46-7
- Exhibit G, Doc 46-8
- Exhibit H, Doc 46-9
- Reply in Support of Motion for Preliminary Injunction, Doc 54
- Memorandum Opinion, Doc 60
- Scheduling Order, Doc 61
- Stipulated Protective Order, Doc 63
- Plaintiff's Memo of Law in Support of Motion for Preliminary Injunction, Doc 9-1
- Transcript of 30(b)(6) Deposition (May 28, 2024)
- 2024.06.24 USG Objections and Second Supplemental Responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories
- 2024.03.06 USG Objections and First Supplemental Responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories
- Expert Report of Peter Arcidiacono
- DOJ Slate Review Report (Updated) – USNA-00003528
- Tab 7A – Common Admissions Acronyms – USNA-00000049
- Coast Guard Cadet Diversity Surges With Minority Wave – SFFA-USNA-000275
- Ethnicity, Gender Now Factors in CGA Admissions – SFFA-USNA-000146
- 20240112 Legacy Oracle AIS Data Dictionary – USNA-00000498
- AIS Data Dictionary – USNA-00000499
- AEB Admissions FY22 Results Submission Oct 22 – USNA-00001372
- AEB Admissions FY21 Results Submission 25 Oct 21 – USNA-00001363
- USNA Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan – USNA-00000391
- Profile Hardship or Adversity – as of 2023-06-22 – USNA-00000500
- Profile First Generation American – USNA-00000504
- Class List for I-Day Coordinator (as of 6/15/21) – USNA-00001240
- Class List for Academic Advising – Pam Schmitt – USNA-00001238
- Profile Other RAB w/ Reason – as of 2022-10-05 – USNA-00000501
- Profile Hardship or Adversity – as of 2022-10-05 -- USNA-00000502

- Profile Language at Home Not English – as of 2022-10-05 -- USNA-00000503
- Accepts in Class – I Day – as of 2023-06-12 – USNA-00001227
- Profile – Hardship or Adversity – as of 2023-06-12 – USNA-00001228
- Accepts – Academic Advising (Class of 2027) – as of 2023-06-12 – USNA-00001229
- Accepts – Academic Advising (Class of 2026) – as of 2022-06-10 – USNA-00001233
- Accepts – Academic Advising – as of 2021-07-14 – USNA-00001234
- Office of Admissions Dean's Meeting 11JUL2023 – USNA-00001209
- Tab A - Class of 2027 5-23-23 – USNA-00000659
- Tab A - Class of 2027 4-3-23 – USNA-00000695
- Tab A - Class of 2027 3-1-23 – USNA-00000667
- Nominations and Appointments Brief July 2023 – USNA-00001163
- USNA Attrition – USNA-00004917
- Admissions Whole Person Multiple (WPM) Study of Potential Impact of No Test Scores Due to COVID-19 – USNA-00000505
- Whole Person Multiple Review – USNA-00000631
- August 2023 Admissions Board Training USNA-00000108
- Blue and Gold Officer Handbook 29 June 2023 – USNA-00001384
- Adm Brief – Prep – USNA-00006329
- Adm Brief – Early Notify – USNA00006564
- Questions and Answers for NAPS Wait List – USNA-00016046
- US Naval Academy Admissions Executive Summary – USNA-00004536
- Superintendent Key Points to Admissions Board 2022 -- USNA-00005494
- Training Week 2023 CGO training 2023 – PrepSchool – USNA-00015965
- Production Report (Official) Jun 23.pdf   USNA-00001246
- Production Report (Official) Sep 22.pptx – USNA-00001355
- AEB Admissions FY21 Results Submission 25 Oct 21.pdf   USNA-00001363
- Tab A1 - Fleet Update.pptx – USNA-00002923
- Tab A4 -Fleet Update.pptx – USNA-00003010
- Tab A2 Class Planning Methodology 20 June 23.docx – USNA-00003159
- NAAA Nov 23.pptx – USNA-00003196
- Impact Report 2022-2023 (1).docx –USNA-00003261
- Copy of May23 Offsite Comprehensive.pptx – USNA-00003266
- Noms Brief - Admissions Training Week 2023.pptx – USNA-00003303
- College Entrance Examination Policy.docx – USNA-00003305
- 20230314 Dean_s Brief.pptx – USNA-00003359
- 20221115 Dean_s Brief.pptx – USNA-00003366
- 24 tab 6.pdf – USNA-00003377

- AEB Admissions FY19 Results Submission.docx – USNA-00003418
- Copy of STEM Training Week 2020 BRIEF.pptx – USNA-00003451
- Copy of Virtual Summer STEM 2021 .pptx – USNA-00003452
- Inc Black Rep in USMC TACAIR Pilot Corps.pdf – USNA-00003962
- CNA-Nov 2006- Emerging Issues in USMC Recruiting.pdf   – USNA-00004205
- NPS-Mar 2021- A Location-Based Inspection of Diversity in Marine Corps Officer Accessions.pdf – USNA-00004251
- Copy of Presentation - Summer Seminar and Summer STEM Applications.pptx – USNA-00004367
- Copy of 7 JAN Summer Programs Brief 2020.pptx – USNA-00004369
- Copy of 30MAY 2023 Joint Brief NASS and STEM.pptx – USNA-00004371
- STEM On Deck Summary RFP 2 (1).pdf – USNA-00004398
- Copy of OPINFO Midshipman Training Brief for Midshipmen - 2023.pptx – USNA-00004415
- Copy of OPINFO 2023 AC Google Meets-Week of 25SEP.pptx – USNA-00004417
- 231025 INSPIRE Supe Talking Points.docx – USNA-00004419
- Inspire Statement for Foundation Apr 23.docx – USNA-00004423
- Class of 2025 Tab 3.pdf – USNA-00004536
- Demographic Data Collection 2007 RFP 8.pdf – USNA-00004796
- OMB Standards for Ethnicity RFP 8.pdf – USNA-00004801
- moving the need pt2.pptx   – USNA-00004811
- EAB Marketing Analysis Class of 2027.pdf – USNA-00004825
- SASC Request Sep 23.pdf   – USNA-00004862
- DEI Info Paper 120121.pdf – USNA-00004897
- Copy of USNA College Entrance Examination Analysis 22 Mar 22.pptx – USNA-00016001
- USNA Custom Report 3.19.23.pdf – USNA-00005488
- Moving the Needle 20278.pptx – USNA-00005499
- Application Completion Goals 2027.pptx – USNA-00005510
- TAB A SASC Title I High School Recruiting Tasker.pptx – USNA-00006699
- TAB B Military Service Academy recruiting at Title I high schools.pdf – USNA-00006700
- Gatekeepers-to-Opportunity-Racial-Disparities-in-Congressional-Nominations-to-the-Service-Academies.pdf – USNA-00006710
- Tab B JOY Recommendations _FINAL_PhaseI andIPhase II.compressed (1).pdf – USNA-00017617
- 7 -CGO-AC Conference Nov 2022 Application, Admissions Board, Prep.ppt – USNA-00017721

- 9 - BGO_Training_NAAA_-_2022.pptx – USNA-00017723
- COSAS 2023 Final Report_DRAFT.docx – USNA-00018355
- 00000000C18804E56065B248B67C05D0B4944C3A24942200.MSG – USNA-00018437
- 00000000788D87D52B120348938B5F60C98354A344042000.MSG – USNA-00018444
- 00000000788D87D52B120348938B5F60C98354A3845D2000.MSG – USNA-00018510
- USNA Admissions_STEM Underway_SOP_Dean Review Session.docx – USNA-00018512
- USNA Admissions_STEM On Deck_SOP_Dean Review Session.docx – USNA-00018518
- USNA Admissions_OPINFO_SOP_Dean Review Session.docx – USNA-00018532
- USNA Admissions_INSPIRE_SOP_Dean Review Session.docx – USNA-00018544
- USNA Admissions_Centers of Influence_SOP_Dean Review Session.docx USNA-00018560
- USNA Admissions_Candidate Visit Weekend_SOP_Dean Review Session.docx – USNA-00018607
- Sen Staff Goals co 2028 Cycle.pptx – USNA-00018645
- Information paper on the USNA application process and outreach efforts (1).docx – USNA-00018692
- Sen Staff Goals co 2028 Cycle.pptx – USNA-00018697
- CGO - Admissions Training Aug 2023- PrepSchool.pdf – USNA-00018820
- '22 – '26 Survey Trends.pptx – USNA-00019219
- AEB Admissions FY22 Results Submission Oct 22.docx – USNA-00019243
- 00000000F06F6F8FDEE8A443B9181E0E1F294C76C4482100.MSG – USNA-00019330
- 9.8.22 JOY x USNA Multicultural Marketing SOW.pdf – USNA-00019332
- 00000000F06F6F8FDEE8A443B9181E0E1F294C76C4FE2100.MSG – USNA-00019386
- Chicago Scholars Young Men of Color One-Pager (August 2022).pdf – USNA-00019388
- 00000000F06F6F8FDEE8A443B9181E0E1F294C7604FF2100.MSG – USNA-00019390
- Chicago Scholars Young Men of Color One-Pager (August 2022).pdf USNA-00019391
- 00000000F06F6F8FDEE8A443B9181E0E1F294C7624862200.MSG – USNA-00019414

- 9.8.22 JOY x USNA Multicultural Marketing SOW.pdf – USNA-00019416
- 00000000A28405FACDBFA748BCB55BC2647C97EFC44A2000.MSG – USNA-00019557
- CVW - Registrants (seniors stats).xlsx – USNA-00019558
- 00000000A28405FACDBFA748BCB55BC2647C97EF84C72000.MSG – USNA-00019584
- EAB_TECS Agreement_MSA Terms & Conditions_2.8.23.pdf – USNA-00019587
- EAB's TECS Sole Source Doc_ United States Naval Academy_Feb 2023.pdf – USNA-00019590
- Supe_HICS_2_15.pdf – USNA-00019602
- EAB State of the Sector.pdf – USNA-00019921
- Class of 2027 Applications & Completions 27 Jun 23.pptx – USNA-00020265
- Admissions Turnover Supe 2023.docx – USNA-00020272
- Class of 2027 Applications & Completions.pptx – USNA-00020294
- Diversity Conf Brief Apr 22 1200.pptx – USNA-00020360
- 00000000E75BFE5E79E17846AFEA6B2E29D6D8BC244C2100.MSG – USNA-00020378
- Diversity Conf Brief Apr 22.pptx – USNA-00020379
- 00000000E75BFE5E79E17846AFEA6B2E29D6D8BC84822100.MSG – USNA-00020385
- APRAttendees14APR.xlsx – USNA-00020401
- USNA Recruiting.docx – USNA-00020421
- Admissions Case Statement - Summer Programs.docx – USNA-00020444
- Admissions Case Statement - Marketing.docx – USNA-00020445
- Admissions Case Statement - Internet Technology.docx – USNA-00020446
- Admissions Case Statement - Engagement.docx – USNA-00020447
- 00000000D5D3378E8D69D14CAC162679CE768BD3644E2000.MSG – USNA-00020610
- Inspire Statement for Foundation Apr 23.docx – USNA-00020611
- 00000000D5D3378E8D69D14CAC162679CE768BD3E44E2000.MSG – USNA-00020613
- Inspire Statement for Foundation Apr 23.docx – USNA-00020614
- Blue Chip Candidate Status updated 4-25-23.docx – USNA-00020617
- 27APR CVW Registered (2).xlsx   – USNA-00020633
- CVW Senior Information 27APR.xlsx – USNA-00020634
- Blue Chip Candidate Status as of 4-10-23.docx – USNA-00020758
- 00000000D5D3378E8D69D14CAC162679CE768BD3C4E82100.MSG – USNA-00020844

- 220331 INSPIRE Supe Talking Points.docx – USNA-00020845
- 00000000D5D3378E8D69D14CAC162679CE768BD3C42D2200.MSG – USNA-00020913
- CVW - 23MAR Seniors.xlsx – USNA-00020915
- Caroline Leicht.docx – USNA-00020938
- Candidate Profile Whipple.docx – USNA-00020939
- Admissions Case Statement - Marketing.docx – USNA-00020993
- Admissions Case Statement - Engagement.docx – USNA-00020994
- Admissions Case Statement - Summer Programs.docx – USNA-00020995
- CVW Roster_3MAR.xlsx – USNA-00021127
- 00000000892E6824BF06CB418803DFF490F8A08FA4C12000.MSG – USNA-00021132
- Inspire Statement for Foundation.docx   – USNA-00021134
- 00000000892E6824BF06CB418803DFF490F8A08F04C82000.MSG – USNA-00021159
- Inspire Statement for Foundation.docx   – USNA-00021160
- 00000000892E6824BF06CB418803DFF490F8A08FC4022100.MSG – USNA-00021181
- TAB F1 - Spring Inspire Program Schedule of Events .pdf– USNA-00021182
- Tab F2 - Inspire Attendees.xlsx– USNA-00021185
- Tab F3 INSPIRE Talking Points Feb 22.docx – USNA-00021186
- Testing Qualification Standards Report_1.21.21 Service Coord.docx – USNA-00021209
- 00000000892E6824BF06CB418803DFF490F8A08F243B2100.MSG – USNA-00021293
- US Naval Academy Audience Strategy Recommendation - 2.18.22.pdf – USNA-00021296
- 28 FEBRUARY BOV SLIDE DECK FINAL FOR PRINT.pdf – USNA-00021314
- 220228 BOV_FINAL.pdf   – USNA-00021357
- October Attendees and Status.xlsx – USNA-00021401
- SASC PSMs Feb 2022.ppt   – USNA-00021403
- SAT DATA.1.pptx   – USNA-00021442
- 231025 INSPIRE Supe Talking Points.docx – USNA-00021766
- AEB Admissions FY23 Results Submission Oct 23 .pdf – USNA-00021774
- Board Actions & Offers 23 Oct 23.docx – USNA-00021781
- 2021-2022 Impact Report_Admissions.pdf –USNA-00021861
- Impact Report 2022-2023 (1).docx – USNA-00021867
- Office of Admissions Forward Facing Events Oct 23.docx – USNA-00021892

- Office of Admissions Forward Facing Events Oct 23.docx – USNA-00021897
- USNA Admissions_STEM On Deck_Final Submission.docx – USNA-00021905
- USNA Admissions_OPINFO_SOP_Final Submission.docx – USNA-00021921
- USNA Admissions_Knowledge Retention and Management_SOP_Final Submission.docx – USNA-00021935
- USNA Admissions_INSPIRE_SOP_Final Submission.docx – USNA-00021938
- USNA Admissions_Centers of Influence_SOP_Final Submission.docx – USNA-00021953
- USNA Admissions_Candidate Visit Weekend_SOP_Final Submission.docx – USNA-00021987
- USNA Admissions_Summer Programs_SOP_Final Submission.docx – USNA-00022000
- USNA Admissions_STEM Underway_SOP_Final Submission.docx – USNA-00022031
- USNA Admissions_STEM On Deck_Final Submission.docx – USNA-00022040
- USNA Admissions_OPINFO_SOP_Final Submission.docx – USNA-00022056
- USNA Admissions_Knowledge Retention and Management_SOP_Final Submission.docx – USNA-00022070
- USNA Admissions_INSPIRE_SOP_Final Submission.docx – USNA-00022073
- USNA Admissions_Centers of Influence_SOP_Final Submission.docx – USNA-00022088
- USNA Admissions_Candidate Visit Weekend_SOP_Final Submission.docx – USNA-00022122
- USNA Admissions_Summer Programs_SOP_Final Submission.docx – USNA-00022135
- USNA Admissions_STEM Underway_SOP_Final Submission.docx – USNA-00022166
- Innovo USNA Admissions Workforce Review 9.29.2023.pdf – USNA-00022175
- 220909 INSPIRE Talking Points.docx USNA-00022242
- 1531 - Race Considerations Regarding Admission to the United States Naval Academy.pdf – USNA-00022271
- Admissions Board Training Overview Aug 21.pptx – USNA-00022554
- 20220524 Assessment and Summary of Recommendations - Admissions (1).pdf – USNA-00022558
- Executive Summary.pdf – USNA-00022605
- COI Summer22 Brief.pptx – USNA-00022683
- 0000000096BA916B2961EC4FB275484762B7DFE604BB2200.MSG – USNA-00022684

- Inspire Statement for Foundation Jul 22.docx – USNA-00022688
- SUPE's Noms-2023-11-06-09-02-41.xlsx – USNA-00022797
- 00000000AAF8239B60D0AF4B81DD3CA5D1981C65A4B42000.MSG – USNA-00022801
- DI Strat Plan.pdf – USNA-00022803
- BOT 2021 Admissions 7 Dec 21.pdf – USNA-00023088
- AEB Admissions FY21 Results Submission 25 Oct 21.docx   – USNA-00023112
- AEB Admissions FY21 Results Submission 25 Oct 21.docx   – USNA-00023119
- AEB Admissions FY21 Results Submission Draft.docx – USNA-00023125
- BOT 2021 Admissions.pptx – USNA-00023134
- Region 3_ Moving the Needle.pptx – USNA-00023783
- NAPSFD 9-1-2021.pptx – USNA-00024058
- AEB Admissions FY22 Results Submission Oct 22.docx – USNA-00024223
- BGO Brief SP22.pptx – USNA-00024258
- BGO Brief SP22.pptx – USNA-00024269
- 0000000060F91729E866B24E85380840908141C504982100.MSG   – USNA-00024330
- Graduation and Attrition Rates - 5.28.2019.docx - USNA-00024420
- 0000000040C6F4AAF62B4C4F91D2B3E895E174EEC4672000.MSG – USNA-00024432
- NAAA and Navy Sports.docx – USNA-00024620
- R - High Interest Topics at USNA.pdf – USNA-00024643
- 000000001650B54149EB3C4481BE7229C1664BB8A4072100.MSG – USNA-00024677
- TAB A Status Update Form for Original CNO Approved TF1N Recommendations.docx – USNA-00024679
- NAAA and Navy Sports.docx – USNA-00024709
- USNA OM,N Budget.docx – USNA-00024718
- USNA Admissions Process - Whole Person Multiple.pptx – USNA-00025295
- 10Nov2022 Foundation BOD Update.pptx – USNA-00025356
- 00000000823A3B874757EA449ACA70BE21B43076A41B2000.MSG – USNA-00025433
- InstitutionalAssessmentReport-Admissions2021.docx.pdf – USNA-00025822
- AEB-AY21-22-Institutional-Effectiveness-Assessment-Report – USNA-00000588
- 0000000053E74329F39F8E4BB0B3395C35CE658D84B82000.MSG – USNA-00025850
- 0000000053E74329F39F8E4BB0B3395C35CE658DA43D2100.MSG – USNA-00025864

125

- BOV Spring 2019.pdf – USNA-00025879
- Admissions.docx – USNA-00025967
- Admissions.docx – USNA-00026012
- AY22 NAPS Report to AEB.pdf – USNA-00026658
- 00000000A9831B80BEC173408D38377C6310981824A62000.MSG – USNA-00026674
- Cermak_2006-2022_Graduation Rate by First Generation.pdf – USNA-00026682
- High Interest Topics at USNA - Jan 2023.docx – USNA-00026834
- Supe Turnover 2023 - NAPS.pdf – USNA-00026848
- Brigade Diversity.docx – USNA-00026955
- Brigade Diversity.docx – USNA-00027007
- USNA Stat Sheet - 2023.pptx – USNA-00027028
- Info Paper - Diversity at MSA.pdf – USNA-00027142
- Copper_NAAA_Board of Control_2012-2021_Varsity Players DATASET.xlsx – USNA-00027157
- NET Task Force Mar 22.ppt – USNA-00027476
- 00000000CE645BAC3BF6124FBDCE5176E53F40CB44512100.MSG – USNA-00028009
- 00000000CE645BAC3BF6124FBDCE5176E53F40CBA4532100.MSG – USNA-00028027
- 00000000CE645BAC3BF6124FBDCE5176E53F40CB44542100.MSG – USNA-00028036
- 000000005DD0C623D844AC4A8C5886E2A0B9DF9944B62200.MSG – USNA-00028460
- 000000000BD604F41F72E2438E3176C6784D41FFC4442000.MSG – USNA-00028499
- Equity and Equality.docx – USNA-00028544
- 000000009DB29DBBE84CDE4192BA62601E1DF13CA4E62100.MSG – USNA-00029196
- COI Summer22 Brief.pptx – USNA-00029202
- STRATOUT_ Training Week 2023 (1).pdf – USNA-00029600
- Training Outreach Tools and Resources.pptx – USNA-00029605
- 00000000B77C2948818ADC459AC0363439223348A42F2100.MSG – USNA-00029606
- 00000000B77C2948818ADC459AC036343922334884362100.MSG – USNA-0002960

126

Appendix D: Simulations

Simulations with 0.5 x Black Coefficient

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Table of Contents

List of Tables

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

1   Simulations for all years together

Table 1: Pooled Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	70.9	35.1	52.1	58.0	67.4
African American	6.8	3.9	32.4	20.5	11.5	6.9
Hispanic	11.0	9.2	20.0	16.3	12.6	10.5
Asian American	15.4	12.5	7.9	6.7	14.0	11.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	1.9	3.8	3.0	2.6	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.6	0.8	1.3	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	12.8	39.7	36.8	18.8	17.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	10.0	8.7	8.8	9.8	9.8
First Generation College	2.9	2.5	11.9	11.0	4.6	4.1
Attended Private HS	23.7	24.0	21.2	21.7	23.3	23.6
% FRPL of HS	22.4	22.1	28.3	27.6	23.5	23.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.9	1.1	1.2	4.9	5.0
SAT Math score	695.6	697.3	572.5	582.3	673.1	676.2
	[640.0, 760.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	692.5	583.4	592.7	671.0	674.2
	[640.0, 740.0]	[650.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	619.0	443.7	452.3	585.0	588.5
	[574.0, 707.0]	[583.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[320.0, 624.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

Table 2: Pooled Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 0.50x Boost for Low SES Family

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	69.4	35.1	48.3	58.0	65.5
African American	6.8	4.2	32.4	21.4	11.5	7.4
Hispanic	11.0	9.9	20.0	18.7	12.6	11.5
Asian American	15.4	13.0	7.9	7.3	14.0	11.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	1.9	3.8	3.1	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.6	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	18.3	39.7	51.8	18.8	24.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.9	8.7	8.6	9.8	9.7
First Generation College	2.9	4.5	11.9	18.3	4.6	7.0
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.7	21.2	20.9	23.3	23.2
% FRPL of HS	22.4	22.6	28.3	28.7	23.5	23.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.6	1.1	0.9	4.9	4.7
SAT Math score	695.6	695.0	572.5	577.6	673.1	673.5
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	690.1	583.4	586.1	671.0	671.1
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	617.2	443.7	448.5	585.0	586.3
	[574.0, 707.0]	[575.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[318.0, 622.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 1 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to .5 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 3: Pooled Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	69.1	35.1	48.6	58.0	65.4
African American	6.8	4.3	32.4	21.3	11.5	7.4
Hispanic	11.0	10.0	20.0	18.5	12.6	11.6
Asian American	15.4	13.1	7.9	7.3	14.0	12.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	1.9	3.8	3.1	2.6	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.6	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	18.7	39.7	51.9	18.8	24.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.7	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.5
First Generation College	2.9	4.6	11.9	18.3	4.6	7.1
Attended Private HS	23.7	20.1	21.2	17.9	23.3	19.7
% FRPL of HS	22.4	24.1	28.3	29.1	23.5	25.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.4	1.1	0.8	4.9	4.6
SAT Math score	695.6	694.4	572.5	577.8	673.1	673.1
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	689.3	583.4	586.1	671.0	670.4
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	618.1	443.7	449.4	585.0	587.3
	[574.0, 707.0]	[581.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[320.0, 622.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 2 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .25 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .25 times the coefficient on African American.

7

Table 4: Pooled Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	69.1	35.1	48.6	58.0	65.3
African American	6.8	4.3	32.4	21.3	11.5	7.4
Hispanic	11.0	10.0	20.0	18.5	12.6	11.6
Asian American	15.4	13.1	7.9	7.3	14.0	12.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	1.9	3.8	3.1	2.6	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.6	0.8	1.3	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	18.7	39.7	51.9	18.8	24.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.7	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.5
First Generation College	2.9	4.6	11.9	18.2	4.6	7.1
Attended Private HS	23.7	20.0	21.2	17.9	23.3	19.7
% FRPL of HS	22.4	24.1	28.3	29.1	23.5	25.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.8	1.1	1.1	4.9	4.2
SAT Math score	695.6	694.3	572.5	577.9	673.1	673.0
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	689.2	583.4	586.2	671.0	670.3
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	618.1	443.7	449.3	585.0	587.2
	[574.0, 707.0]	[581.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[320.0, 622.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 3 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

Table 5: Pooled Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	68.2	35.1	48.1	58.0	64.5
African American	6.8	4.2	32.4	20.7	11.5	7.2
Hispanic	11.0	10.5	20.0	19.1	12.6	12.1
Asian American	15.4	13.4	7.9	7.6	14.0	12.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.2	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.6	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	19.9	39.7	53.4	18.8	26.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.4	8.7	8.4	9.8	9.2
First Generation College	2.9	4.9	11.9	18.9	4.6	7.5
Attended Private HS	23.7	19.0	21.2	16.9	23.3	18.6
% FRPL of HS	22.4	24.8	28.3	29.8	23.5	25.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	3.3	6.5	0.9	12.2	2.9
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.9	1.1	1.3	4.9	4.3
SAT Math score	695.6	698.6	572.5	579.3	673.1	676.8
	[640.0, 760.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	694.2	583.4	588.7	671.0	674.9
	[640.0, 740.0]	[650.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	629.5	443.7	458.2	585.0	598.1
	[574.0, 707.0]	[613.0, 709.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[324.0, 627.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 4 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

8

Table 6: Pooled Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	68.7	35.1	48.4	58.0	65.0
African American	6.8	4.4	32.4	21.4	11.5	7.5
Hispanic	11.0	10.4	20.0	18.6	12.6	11.9
Asian American	15.4	13.0	7.9	7.3	14.0	11.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.1	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	19.8	39.7	51.8	18.8	25.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.6	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.4
First Generation College	2.9	5.0	11.9	18.2	4.6	7.4
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.0	21.2	21.7	23.3	22.8
% FRPL of HS	22.4	23.8	28.3	27.8	23.5	24.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.4	1.1	0.9	4.9	4.5
SAT Math score	695.6	692.6	572.5	577.2	673.1	671.5
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	688.2	583.4	585.9	671.0	669.4
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	617.7	443.7	447.3	585.0	586.5
	[574.0, 707.0]	[578.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[317.0, 621.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 3 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.25 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 7: Pooled Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	68.7	35.1	45.8	58.0	64.5
African American	6.8	4.4	32.4	22.3	11.5	7.7
Hispanic	11.0	10.4	20.0	19.1	12.6	12.0
Asian American	15.4	13.0	7.9	8.6	14.0	12.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.1	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.0	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	19.8	39.7	82.6	18.8	31.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.6	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.4
First Generation College	2.9	5.0	11.9	15.5	4.6	6.9
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.0	21.2	19.2	23.3	22.3
% FRPL of HS	22.4	23.8	28.3	28.8	23.5	24.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.4	1.1	0.9	4.9	4.6
SAT Math score	695.6	692.6	572.5	580.5	673.1	672.1
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	688.2	583.4	585.7	671.0	669.4
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	617.7	443.7	450.2	585.0	587.0
	[574.0, 707.0]	[578.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[323.0, 620.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 6 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

Table 8: Pooled Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	69.1	35.1	51.8	58.0	62.7
African American	6.8	4.3	32.4	16.1	11.5	8.6
Hispanic	11.0	10.2	20.0	18.3	12.6	13.2
Asian American	15.4	12.9	7.9	9.9	14.0	11.8
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	1.9	3.8	2.8	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.6	0.8	1.0	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	20.8	39.7	74.7	18.8	40.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.5	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.1
First Generation College	2.9	5.1	11.9	12.9	4.6	8.0
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.1	21.2	18.4	23.3	21.4
% FRPL of HS	22.4	24.1	28.3	28.6	23.5	25.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.4	6.5	3.3	12.2	9.7
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.6	1.1	1.4	4.9	4.1
SAT Math score	695.6	696.4	572.5	600.6	673.1	661.3
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[540.0, 660.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	691.4	583.4	607.0	671.0	660.5
	[640.0, 740.0]	[650.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[550.0, 670.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	624.8	443.7	465.2	585.0	566.3
	[574.0, 707.0]	[602.0, 710.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[332.0, 631.0]		
N	5,642	4,378	1,264	2,528	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

Table 9: Pooled Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	64.5	35.1	38.9	58.0	59.8
African American	6.8	5.4	32.4	25.4	11.5	9.0
Hispanic	11.0	14.0	20.0	23.9	12.6	15.8
Asian American	15.4	12.1	7.9	7.2	14.0	11.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.6	3.8	3.7	2.6	2.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.4	0.8	0.9	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	21.1	39.7	82.6	18.8	32.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.5	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.3
First Generation College	2.9	5.5	11.9	16.9	4.6	7.6
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.0	21.2	19.6	23.3	22.3
% FRPL of HS	22.4	24.2	28.3	28.9	23.5	25.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.3	1.1	0.8	4.9	4.5
SAT Math score	695.6	691.7	572.5	574.6	673.1	670.3
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	687.3	583.4	580.1	671.0	667.7
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	618.8	443.7	445.5	585.0	587.0
	[574.0, 707.0]	[583.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[318.0, 613.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

10

Table 10: Pooled Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	60.9	35.1	33.8	58.0	55.9
African American	6.8	6.2	32.4	27.7	11.5	10.1
Hispanic	11.0	17.0	20.0	27.4	12.6	18.9
Asian American	15.4	11.4	7.9	6.2	14.0	10.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	3.2	3.8	4.1	2.6	3.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.3	0.8	0.8	1.3	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	22.2	39.7	82.6	18.8	33.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.5	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.3
First Generation College	2.9	6.0	11.9	17.8	4.6	8.1
Attended Private HS	23.7	22.9	21.2	20.0	23.3	22.4
% FRPL of HS	22.4	24.5	28.3	28.9	23.5	25.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.2	1.1	0.7	4.9	4.4
SAT Math score	695.6	691.0	572.5	570.4	673.1	668.9
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	686.7	583.4	576.2	671.0	666.4
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	619.7	443.7	441.6	585.0	587.1
	[574.0, 707.0]	[586.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[314.0, 610.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 11: Pooled Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	55.1	35.1	27.2	58.0	50.0
African American	6.8	7.4	32.4	30.7	11.5	11.7
Hispanic	11.0	22.0	20.0	31.9	12.6	23.8
Asian American	15.4	10.2	7.9	4.9	14.0	9.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	4.1	3.8	4.6	2.6	4.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.2	0.8	0.6	1.3	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	24.1	39.7	82.6	18.8	34.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.4	8.7	8.6	9.8	9.2
First Generation College	2.9	6.7	11.9	19.0	4.6	9.0
Attended Private HS	23.7	22.8	21.2	20.5	23.3	22.4
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.1	28.3	28.7	23.5	25.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.1	1.1	0.5	4.9	4.3
SAT Math score	695.6	689.8	572.5	564.8	673.1	666.9
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	685.5	583.4	571.0	671.0	664.6
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	621.3	443.7	435.5	585.0	587.3
	[574.0, 707.0]	[590.0, 709.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[308.0, 599.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 12: Pooled Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	67.4	35.1	44.0	58.0	63.1
African American	6.8	4.6	32.4	23.1	11.5	8.0
Hispanic	11.0	11.0	20.0	20.0	12.6	12.7
Asian American	15.4	13.5	7.9	8.6	14.0	12.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.2	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	26.7	39.7	82.6	18.8	36.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.5	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.3
First Generation College	2.9	5.9	11.9	16.5	4.6	7.9
Attended Private HS	23.7	22.6	21.2	20.1	23.3	22.1
% FRPL of HS	22.4	24.3	28.3	28.3	23.5	25.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.1	1.1	0.8	4.9	4.3
SAT Math score	695.6	691.8	572.5	576.6	673.1	670.7
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	687.2	583.4	581.7	671.0	667.8
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	618.4	443.7	442.5	585.0	586.2
	[574.0, 707.0]	[581.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[314.0, 608.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 13: Pooled Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	66.4	35.1	42.8	58.0	62.0
African American	6.8	4.8	32.4	23.6	11.5	8.2
Hispanic	11.0	11.5	20.0	20.5	12.6	13.2
Asian American	15.4	13.9	7.9	8.8	14.0	13.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.3	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.4	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	32.5	39.7	82.6	18.8	41.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.4	8.7	8.6	9.8	9.2
First Generation College	2.9	6.7	11.9	17.0	4.6	8.6
Attended Private HS	23.7	22.2	21.2	20.7	23.3	21.9
% FRPL of HS	22.4	24.9	28.3	28.0	23.5	25.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.8	1.1	0.7	4.9	4.1
SAT Math score	695.6	691.2	572.5	574.2	673.1	669.8
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	686.4	583.4	579.1	671.0	666.8
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	619.2	443.7	435.7	585.0	585.6
	[574.0, 707.0]	[583.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[308.0, 598.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 14: Pooled Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	64.8	35.1	41.4	58.0	60.5
African American	6.8	5.0	32.4	24.2	11.5	8.5
Hispanic	11.0	12.3	20.0	21.0	12.6	13.9
Asian American	15.4	14.6	7.9	9.1	14.0	13.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.2	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.3	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	41.6	39.7	82.6	18.8	49.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.2	8.7	8.7	9.8	9.1
First Generation College	2.9	8.0	11.9	17.7	4.6	9.8
Attended Private HS	23.7	21.5	21.2	21.5	23.3	21.5
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.7	28.3	27.4	23.5	26.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.4	1.1	0.6	4.9	3.7
SAT Math score	695.6	690.5	572.5	571.3	673.1	668.7
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	685.5	583.4	576.0	671.0	665.4
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	620.7	443.7	426.2	585.0	585.1
	[574.0, 707.0]	[587.0, 709.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[298.0, 581.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

2   Combined Simulation 1 by year

Table 15: Class of 2023 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	71.5	40.3	56.3	59.5	68.6
African American	6.8	4.3	29.9	17.1	11.2	6.7
Hispanic	10.8	9.3	19.1	16.4	12.3	10.7
Asian American	14.9	11.5	5.1	4.6	13.0	10.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.7	4.4	3.9	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	14.4	45.3	41.1	21.3	19.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.8	8.1	8.1	9.5	9.5
First Generation College	2.6	2.4	11.6	11.1	4.3	4.0
Attended Private HS	25.8	26.2	20.4	21.1	24.8	25.2
% FRPL of HS	21.8	21.5	31.4	30.4	23.7	23.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	5.2	1.4	1.3	4.5	4.5
SAT Math score	715.1	715.6	584.8	593.6	690.3	692.4
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	716.1	599.6	607.3	692.5	695.4
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 790.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[560.0, 660.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	584.2	421.6	428.7	551.9	554.5
	[470.0, 694.0]	[470.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[296.0, 602.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

Table 16: Class of 2024 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	72.8	38.2	52.2	61.2	69.3
African American	6.8	4.4	31.0	20.1	11.0	7.1
Hispanic	10.3	9.0	20.4	18.1	12.0	10.6
Asian American	13.1	10.3	6.3	5.8	11.9	9.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.2	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.3	0.5	0.9	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	12.1	38.7	36.6	17.6	16.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.5	8.3	8.4	9.4	9.3
First Generation College	2.3	1.9	13.6	13.2	4.2	3.9
Attended Private HS	23.4	23.8	22.9	23.4	23.3	23.7
% FRPL of HS	22.9	22.6	30.7	29.9	24.2	23.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	6.0	1.6	2.0	5.3	5.3
SAT Math score	711.0	711.7	574.6	581.4	687.6	689.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	712.8	588.9	596.1	690.6	692.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[670.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	587.3	420.5	426.2	556.6	559.6
	[476.0, 694.0]	[484.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[297.0, 581.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

Table 17: Class of 2025 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	71.1	34.2	53.3	57.9	67.7
African American	5.8	3.1	31.8	19.6	10.7	6.2
Hispanic	11.4	9.3	21.4	16.6	13.3	10.7
Asian American	16.5	13.8	8.5	6.8	15.0	12.5
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.5	3.5	2.5	2.1	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.2	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	13.6	34.8	32.8	18.4	17.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	10.4	9.2	9.3	10.1	10.2
First Generation College	2.7	2.3	6.7	5.6	3.4	2.9
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.6	20.4	20.9	22.7	23.1
% FRPL of HS	22.2	21.9	26.1	25.3	22.9	22.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	7.0	0.9	1.0	5.7	5.8
SAT Math score	684.1	687.3	566.9	581.0	662.0	667.3
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	677.4	576.7	589.7	656.0	660.8
	[640.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	635.3	486.4	497.3	605.0	609.2
	[603.0, 714.0]	[612.0, 714.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[351.0, 663.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

Table 18: Class of 2026 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	70.2	28.3	47.1	56.6	66.2
African American	7.0	3.5	36.6	25.0	12.2	7.2
Hispanic	10.5	8.9	19.1	14.4	12.0	9.8
Asian American	15.6	13.2	11.3	9.2	14.9	12.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.1	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	2.0	0.7	1.4	1.7	1.9
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	13.8	40.3	37.0	19.5	17.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	10.0	9.3	9.3	9.9	9.9
First Generation College	3.2	2.8	15.7	13.9	5.4	4.7
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.0	21.3	21.3	21.7	21.9
% FRPL of HS	22.7	22.4	25.2	25.1	23.1	22.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.8	0.4	0.6	4.0	4.1
SAT Math score	686.1	688.4	564.5	574.2	665.0	668.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	681.0	569.9	579.2	660.1	663.3
	[630.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	639.4	444.9	455.4	604.0	607.5
	[618.0, 714.0]	[621.0, 714.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[320.0, 616.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

3   Combined Simulation 2 by year

Table 19: Class of 2023 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 0.50x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	70.2	40.3	51.4	59.5	66.7
African American	6.8	4.6	29.9	17.9	11.2	7.2
Hispanic	10.8	9.8	19.1	19.3	12.3	11.6
Asian American	14.9	11.8	5.1	5.4	13.0	10.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.8	4.4	4.2	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	19.3	45.3	55.2	21.3	26.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.7	8.1	7.9	9.5	9.4
First Generation College	2.6	4.4	11.6	18.2	4.3	7.1
Attended Private HS	25.8	25.9	20.4	19.9	24.8	24.8
% FRPL of HS	21.8	22.0	31.4	32.3	23.7	23.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.9	1.4	0.9	4.5	4.2
SAT Math score	715.1	713.7	584.8	586.9	690.3	689.5
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	714.3	599.6	599.8	692.5	692.5
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 780.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[550.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	583.8	421.6	430.3	551.9	554.5
	[470.0, 694.0]	[470.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[300.0, 616.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 15 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to .5 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 20: Class of 2024 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 0.50x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	71.5	38.2	49.0	61.2	67.6
African American	6.8	4.6	31.0	20.7	11.0	7.3
Hispanic	10.3	9.8	20.4	20.3	12.0	11.6
Asian American	13.1	10.6	6.3	6.4	11.9	9.8
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.3	0.5	0.9	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	16.5	38.7	49.3	17.6	22.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.4	8.3	8.2	9.4	9.2
First Generation College	2.3	3.7	13.6	20.6	4.2	6.6
Attended Private HS	23.4	23.3	22.9	22.9	23.3	23.3
% FRPL of HS	22.9	23.1	30.7	31.3	24.2	24.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.7	1.6	1.6	5.3	5.0
SAT Math score	711.0	709.7	574.6	576.7	687.6	686.9
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	711.0	588.9	590.1	690.6	690.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	587.1	420.5	424.9	556.6	559.3
	[476.0, 694.0]	[484.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[296.0, 575.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 16 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to .5 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 21: Class of 2025 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 0.50x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	69.7	34.2	50.6	57.9	66.1
African American	5.8	3.4	31.8	20.4	10.7	6.6
Hispanic	11.4	10.1	21.4	17.7	13.3	11.6
Asian American	16.5	14.2	8.5	7.6	15.0	12.9
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.5	3.5	2.5	2.1	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.2	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	19.3	34.8	48.0	18.4	24.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	10.3	9.2	9.2	10.1	10.1
First Generation College	2.7	3.8	6.7	11.0	3.4	5.2
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.3	20.4	20.3	22.7	22.7
% FRPL of HS	22.2	22.3	26.1	25.9	22.9	23.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.7	0.9	0.7	5.7	5.6
SAT Math score	684.1	685.0	566.9	578.6	662.0	665.0
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	674.6	576.7	584.3	656.0	657.6
	[640.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	633.1	486.4	491.1	605.0	606.3
	[603.0, 714.0]	[608.0, 714.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 650.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 17 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to .5 times the coefficient on African American.

18

Table 22: Class of 2026 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 0.50x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	68.8	28.3	42.6	56.6	64.2
African American	7.0	4.0	36.6	26.3	12.2	7.9
Hispanic	10.5	9.6	19.1	17.5	12.0	10.9
Asian American	15.6	13.7	11.3	9.5	14.9	13.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.1	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.9	0.7	1.2	1.7	1.8
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	20.1	40.3	54.6	19.5	26.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	10.0	9.3	9.2	9.9	9.8
First Generation College	3.2	5.0	15.7	23.1	5.4	8.1
Attended Private HS	21.8	21.8	21.3	20.5	21.7	21.5
% FRPL of HS	22.7	22.7	25.2	25.8	23.1	23.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.5	0.4	0.3	4.0	3.8
SAT Math score	686.1	685.2	564.5	568.9	665.0	665.0
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	677.9	569.9	571.7	660.1	659.5
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	636.0	444.9	446.7	604.0	603.2
	[618.0, 714.0]	[616.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[314.0, 602.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 18 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to .5 times the coefficient on African American.

4   Combined Simulation 3 by year

Table 23: Class of 2023 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	69.9	40.3	51.5	59.5	66.4
African American	6.8	4.7	29.9	17.7	11.2	7.2
Hispanic	10.8	10.1	19.1	19.4	12.3	11.8
Asian American	14.9	11.9	5.1	5.5	13.0	10.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.8	4.4	4.1	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	19.8	45.3	55.1	21.3	26.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.5	8.1	7.8	9.5	9.2
First Generation College	2.6	4.6	11.6	18.3	4.3	7.2
Attended Private HS	25.8	21.4	20.4	16.2	24.8	20.4
% FRPL of HS	21.8	24.2	31.4	32.3	23.7	25.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.8	1.4	0.9	4.5	4.0
SAT Math score	715.1	712.7	584.8	587.5	690.3	688.9
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	713.1	599.6	600.0	692.5	691.5
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 780.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[550.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	586.8	421.6	433.0	551.9	557.4
	[470.0, 694.0]	[476.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[303.0, 618.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 19 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .25 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .25 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 24: Class of 2024 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	71.3	38.2	49.5	61.2	67.5
African American	6.8	4.7	31.0	20.8	11.0	7.4
Hispanic	10.3	10.0	20.4	19.7	12.0	11.7
Asian American	13.1	10.5	6.3	6.4	11.9	9.8
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.9	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	17.0	38.7	49.3	17.6	22.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.2	8.3	8.0	9.4	9.0
First Generation College	2.3	3.9	13.6	20.1	4.2	6.7
Attended Private HS	23.4	19.1	22.9	18.9	23.3	19.1
% FRPL of HS	22.9	25.1	30.7	31.7	24.2	26.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.5	1.6	1.5	5.3	4.9
SAT Math score	711.0	708.7	574.6	577.6	687.6	686.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	709.7	588.9	590.3	690.6	689.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	589.9	420.5	428.2	556.6	562.1
	[476.0, 694.0]	[494.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[297.0, 589.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 20 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .25 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .25 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 25: Class of 2025 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	69.3	34.2	50.9	57.9	65.9
African American	5.8	3.4	31.8	20.4	10.7	6.6
Hispanic	11.4	10.2	21.4	17.4	13.3	11.5
Asian American	16.5	14.5	8.5	7.7	15.0	13.2
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.5	3.5	2.4	2.1	1.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.2	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	19.5	34.8	48.4	18.4	25.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	10.1	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.9
First Generation College	2.7	3.9	6.7	10.9	3.4	5.2
Attended Private HS	23.3	20.6	20.4	18.0	22.7	20.1
% FRPL of HS	22.2	23.3	26.1	26.5	22.9	23.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.6	0.9	0.7	5.7	5.5
SAT Math score	684.1	684.7	566.9	578.3	662.0	664.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	674.0	576.7	584.0	656.0	657.0
	[640.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	632.8	486.4	489.8	605.0	605.8
	[603.0, 714.0]	[608.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 649.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 21 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .25 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .25 times the coefficient on African American.

21

Table 26: Class of 2026 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	68.6	28.3	42.7	56.6	64.1
African American	7.0	4.1	36.6	26.0	12.2	7.9
Hispanic	10.5	9.6	19.1	17.6	12.0	11.0
Asian American	15.6	13.8	11.3	9.4	14.9	13.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.1	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.9	0.7	1.2	1.7	1.8
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	20.3	40.3	54.9	19.5	26.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.8	9.3	9.1	9.9	9.7
First Generation College	3.2	5.1	15.7	23.5	5.4	8.3
Attended Private HS	21.8	19.0	21.3	18.6	21.7	18.9
% FRPL of HS	22.7	23.7	25.2	26.4	23.1	24.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.4	0.4	0.3	4.0	3.7
SAT Math score	686.1	685.0	564.5	568.8	665.0	664.9
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	677.5	569.9	571.6	660.1	659.2
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	635.8	444.9	445.8	604.0	602.9
	[618.0, 714.0]	[616.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[314.0, 602.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 22 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .25 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .25 times the coefficient on African American.

5   Combined Simulation 4 by year

Table 27: Class of 2023 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	70.0	40.3	51.5	59.5	66.5
African American	6.8	4.7	29.9	17.7	11.2	7.2
Hispanic	10.8	10.1	19.1	19.3	12.3	11.8
Asian American	14.9	11.9	5.1	5.6	13.0	10.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.8	4.4	4.1	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	19.8	45.3	55.0	21.3	26.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.5	8.1	7.8	9.5	9.2
First Generation College	2.6	4.6	11.6	18.3	4.3	7.2
Attended Private HS	25.8	21.3	20.4	16.2	24.8	20.3
% FRPL of HS	21.8	24.2	31.4	32.3	23.7	25.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.2	1.4	1.3	4.5	3.6
SAT Math score	715.1	712.8	584.8	587.7	690.3	688.9
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	713.1	599.6	600.1	692.5	691.6
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 780.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[550.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	586.9	421.6	432.8	551.9	557.5
	[470.0, 694.0]	[476.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[303.0, 618.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 23 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Table 28: Class of 2024 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	71.3	38.2	49.5	61.2	67.6
African American	6.8	4.7	31.0	20.8	11.0	7.4
Hispanic	10.3	10.0	20.4	19.6	12.0	11.6
Asian American	13.1	10.5	6.3	6.3	11.9	9.8
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.9	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	17.1	38.7	49.2	17.6	22.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.2	8.3	8.0	9.4	9.0
First Generation College	2.3	3.9	13.6	20.0	4.2	6.7
Attended Private HS	23.4	19.1	22.9	18.9	23.3	19.0
% FRPL of HS	22.9	25.1	30.7	31.7	24.2	26.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.1	1.6	2.0	5.3	4.5
SAT Math score	711.0	708.7	574.6	577.5	687.6	686.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	709.7	588.9	590.4	690.6	689.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	589.9	420.5	427.9	556.6	562.1
	[476.0, 694.0]	[494.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[297.0, 584.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 24 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

Table 29: Class of 2025 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	69.3	34.2	51.0	57.9	65.8
African American	5.8	3.4	31.8	20.4	10.7	6.6
Hispanic	11.4	10.2	21.4	17.4	13.3	11.6
Asian American	16.5	14.5	8.5	7.7	15.0	13.2
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.5	3.5	2.4	2.1	1.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.2	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	19.6	34.8	48.4	18.4	25.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	10.1	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.9
First Generation College	2.7	3.9	6.7	10.9	3.4	5.2
Attended Private HS	23.3	20.6	20.4	18.0	22.7	20.1
% FRPL of HS	22.2	23.3	26.1	26.5	22.9	23.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.9	0.9	0.9	5.7	5.0
SAT Math score	684.1	684.5	566.9	578.4	662.0	664.5
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	673.9	576.7	584.0	656.0	656.9
	[640.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	632.6	486.4	489.8	605.0	605.6
	[603.0, 714.0]	[608.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 649.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 25 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

24

Table 30: Class of 2026 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	68.5	28.3	42.7	56.6	64.1
African American	7.0	4.1	36.6	26.0	12.2	7.9
Hispanic	10.5	9.7	19.1	17.6	12.0	11.0
Asian American	15.6	13.8	11.3	9.4	14.9	13.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.1	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.9	0.7	1.3	1.7	1.8
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	20.4	40.3	54.9	19.5	26.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.8	9.3	9.1	9.9	9.7
First Generation College	3.2	5.1	15.7	23.5	5.4	8.3
Attended Private HS	21.8	18.9	21.3	18.6	21.7	18.9
% FRPL of HS	22.7	23.7	25.2	26.4	23.1	24.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.9	0.4	0.4	4.0	3.3
SAT Math score	686.1	684.9	564.5	568.8	665.0	664.8
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	677.4	569.9	571.6	660.1	659.1
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	635.8	444.9	445.8	604.0	602.9
	[618.0, 714.0]	[616.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[314.0, 602.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 26 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

6   Combined Simulation 5 by year

Table 31: Class of 2023 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	68.6	40.3	50.4	59.5	65.2
African American	6.8	4.6	29.9	17.4	11.2	7.0
Hispanic	10.8	10.6	19.1	20.8	12.3	12.6
Asian American	14.9	12.5	5.1	5.7	13.0	11.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.0	4.4	4.3	2.6	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.7	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	21.2	45.3	56.3	21.3	27.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.3	8.1	7.6	9.5	8.9
First Generation College	2.6	5.0	11.6	19.0	4.3	7.7
Attended Private HS	25.8	19.8	20.4	15.3	24.8	18.9
% FRPL of HS	21.8	25.1	31.4	33.4	23.7	26.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	2.1	7.6	0.5	11.8	1.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.5	1.4	1.5	4.5	3.9
SAT Math score	715.1	717.9	584.8	589.0	690.3	693.3
	[660.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	718.8	599.6	602.5	692.5	696.6
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 790.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[550.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	602.8	421.6	444.6	551.9	572.6
	[470.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[314.0, 624.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 27 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

Table 32: Class of 2024 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	70.6	38.2	49.0	61.2	66.9
African American	6.8	4.4	31.0	19.7	11.0	7.0
Hispanic	10.3	10.4	20.4	20.6	12.0	12.1
Asian American	13.1	10.9	6.3	6.6	11.9	10.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.4	3.5	3.1	2.9	2.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.3	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	18.3	38.7	51.7	17.6	24.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.7	8.3	7.8	9.4	8.5
First Generation College	2.3	4.2	13.6	21.3	4.2	7.1
Attended Private HS	23.4	18.3	22.9	16.2	23.3	17.9
% FRPL of HS	22.9	25.9	30.7	33.0	24.2	27.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	3.1	8.6	0.4	13.6	2.7
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.2	1.6	2.2	5.3	4.7
SAT Math score	711.0	713.9	574.6	578.8	687.6	690.7
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	716.0	588.9	593.5	690.6	695.0
	[660.0, 770.0]	[670.0, 790.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	607.7	420.5	442.3	556.6	579.3
	[476.0, 694.0]	[538.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[313.0, 616.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 28 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

Table 33: Class of 2025 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	69.0	34.2	50.9	57.9	65.6
African American	5.8	3.2	31.8	19.9	10.7	6.4
Hispanic	11.4	10.5	21.4	17.4	13.3	11.8
Asian American	16.5	14.7	8.5	8.1	15.0	13.4
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.5	3.5	2.5	2.1	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.7	1.2	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	20.5	34.8	49.3	18.4	26.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.8	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.7
First Generation College	2.7	4.2	6.7	11.0	3.4	5.5
Attended Private HS	23.3	19.9	20.4	17.7	22.7	19.5
% FRPL of HS	22.2	23.8	26.1	26.6	22.9	24.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	4.0	5.0	1.5	11.9	3.5
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.0	0.9	1.0	5.7	5.0
SAT Math score	684.1	690.3	566.9	579.9	662.0	669.5
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	680.0	576.7	586.1	656.0	662.3
	[640.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	642.2	486.4	495.3	605.0	614.5
	[603.0, 714.0]	[623.0, 714.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[356.0, 654.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 29 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

Table 34: Class of 2026 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	67.2	28.3	42.3	56.6	62.9
African American	7.0	4.5	36.6	25.6	12.2	8.1
Hispanic	10.5	10.1	19.1	17.9	12.0	11.4
Asian American	15.6	14.2	11.3	9.8	14.9	13.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.1	4.0	3.1	2.7	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	2.0	0.7	1.3	1.7	1.8
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	21.7	40.3	56.4	19.5	27.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.7	9.3	9.0	9.9	9.6
First Generation College	3.2	5.5	15.7	24.0	5.4	8.7
Attended Private HS	21.8	18.2	21.3	18.4	21.7	18.2
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.2	25.2	26.5	23.1	24.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	3.8	5.1	1.1	11.0	3.3
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.1	0.4	0.4	4.0	3.4
SAT Math score	686.1	687.1	564.5	570.3	665.0	666.9
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	680.3	569.9	574.1	660.1	661.9
	[630.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	642.4	444.9	450.4	604.0	609.1
	[618.0, 714.0]	[625.0, 714.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[320.0, 612.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 30 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

7   Combined Simulation 6 by year

Table 35: Class of 2023 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	69.6	40.3	51.6	59.5	66.2
African American	6.8	4.6	29.9	17.8	11.2	7.2
Hispanic	10.8	10.6	19.1	19.3	12.3	12.3
Asian American	14.9	11.7	5.1	5.3	13.0	10.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.8	4.4	4.3	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	20.9	45.3	55.5	21.3	27.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.4	8.1	7.8	9.5	9.1
First Generation College	2.6	5.0	11.6	18.1	4.3	7.5
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.3	20.4	21.0	24.8	23.7
% FRPL of HS	21.8	23.9	31.4	30.5	23.7	25.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.6	1.4	0.9	4.5	3.9
SAT Math score	715.1	711.5	584.8	586.8	690.3	687.7
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	712.5	599.6	599.7	692.5	691.0
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 780.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[550.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	588.4	421.6	428.2	551.9	557.8
	[470.0, 694.0]	[479.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[296.0, 602.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 23 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.25 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 36: Class of 2024 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	70.8	38.2	49.4	61.2	67.2
African American	6.8	4.7	31.0	20.6	11.0	7.4
Hispanic	10.3	10.4	20.4	19.8	12.0	12.0
Asian American	13.1	10.6	6.3	6.5	11.9	9.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.9	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	17.9	38.7	49.2	17.6	23.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.1	8.3	8.1	9.4	8.9
First Generation College	2.3	4.3	13.6	20.5	4.2	7.0
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.8	22.9	24.0	23.3	22.1
% FRPL of HS	22.9	24.8	30.7	29.8	24.2	25.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.5	1.6	1.6	5.3	4.9
SAT Math score	711.0	708.0	574.6	576.6	687.6	685.5
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	709.6	588.9	590.2	690.6	689.1
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	591.1	420.5	422.4	556.6	562.2
	[476.0, 694.0]	[506.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[296.0, 567.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 24 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.25 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 37: Class of 2025 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	68.8	34.2	50.2	57.9	65.3
African American	5.8	3.6	31.8	20.6	10.7	6.8
Hispanic	11.4	10.7	21.4	17.7	13.3	12.0
Asian American	16.5	14.2	8.5	7.6	15.0	12.9
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.7	3.5	2.6	2.1	1.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.3	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	20.3	34.8	47.9	18.4	25.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	10.0	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.8
First Generation College	2.7	4.2	6.7	11.0	3.4	5.5
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.5	20.4	20.9	22.7	23.0
% FRPL of HS	22.2	23.0	26.1	25.6	22.9	23.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.4	0.9	0.6	5.7	5.3
SAT Math score	684.1	682.7	566.9	577.9	662.0	663.0
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	672.3	576.7	583.6	656.0	655.6
	[640.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	632.2	486.4	491.2	605.0	605.6
	[603.0, 714.0]	[604.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 650.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 25 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.25 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 38: Class of 2026 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	68.2	28.3	42.6	56.6	63.8
African American	7.0	4.3	36.6	26.4	12.2	8.2
Hispanic	10.5	9.9	19.1	17.5	12.0	11.2
Asian American	15.6	13.7	11.3	9.5	14.9	12.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.9	0.7	1.1	1.7	1.8
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	21.7	40.3	54.8	19.5	27.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.7	9.3	9.1	9.9	9.6
First Generation College	3.2	5.6	15.7	23.2	5.4	8.7
Attended Private HS	21.8	21.8	21.3	20.8	21.7	21.6
% FRPL of HS	22.7	23.4	25.2	25.7	23.1	23.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.4	0.4	0.4	4.0	3.7
SAT Math score	686.1	682.3	564.5	568.2	665.0	662.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	675.5	569.9	571.3	660.1	657.5
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	633.2	444.9	446.1	604.0	600.8
	[618.0, 714.0]	[610.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[314.0, 602.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 26 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.25 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

8   Combined Simulation 7 by year

Table 39: Class of 2023 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	69.6	40.3	44.9	59.5	64.9
African American	6.8	4.6	29.9	20.3	11.2	7.6
Hispanic	10.8	10.6	19.1	21.1	12.3	12.6
Asian American	14.9	11.7	5.1	7.2	13.0	10.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.8	4.4	5.1	2.6	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.6	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	20.9	45.3	87.1	21.3	33.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.4	8.1	7.9	9.5	9.1
First Generation College	2.6	5.0	11.6	14.3	4.3	6.8
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.3	20.4	18.5	24.8	23.2
% FRPL of HS	21.8	23.9	31.4	31.1	23.7	25.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.6	1.4	1.0	4.5	3.9
SAT Math score	715.1	711.5	584.8	582.5	690.3	686.9
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	712.5	599.6	594.7	692.5	690.0
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 780.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	588.4	421.6	429.1	551.9	558.0
	[470.0, 694.0]	[479.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[301.0, 589.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 35 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

Table 40: Class of 2024 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	70.8	38.2	45.3	61.2	66.5
African American	6.8	4.7	31.0	22.4	11.0	7.7
Hispanic	10.3	10.4	20.4	21.2	12.0	12.2
Asian American	13.1	10.6	6.3	7.8	11.9	10.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.6	2.9	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	17.9	38.7	81.7	17.6	28.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.1	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.9
First Generation College	2.3	4.3	13.6	18.4	4.2	6.7
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.8	22.9	20.6	23.3	21.6
% FRPL of HS	22.9	24.8	30.7	31.6	24.2	25.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.5	1.6	1.5	5.3	4.8
SAT Math score	711.0	708.0	574.6	578.8	687.6	685.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	709.6	588.9	589.0	690.6	688.9
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	591.1	420.5	429.2	556.6	563.3
	[476.0, 694.0]	[506.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[297.0, 570.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 36 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

Table 41: Class of 2025 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	68.8	34.2	50.4	57.9	65.3
African American	5.8	3.6	31.8	20.5	10.7	6.8
Hispanic	11.4	10.7	21.4	16.4	13.3	11.7
Asian American	16.5	14.2	8.5	9.7	15.0	13.3
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.7	3.5	2.0	2.1	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	0.9	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	20.3	34.8	80.5	18.4	31.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	10.0	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.8
First Generation College	2.7	4.2	6.7	9.1	3.4	5.1
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.5	20.4	17.6	22.7	22.3
% FRPL of HS	22.2	23.0	26.1	26.7	22.9	23.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.4	0.9	0.8	5.7	5.4
SAT Math score	684.1	682.7	566.9	587.2	662.0	664.7
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 660.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	672.3	576.7	585.1	656.0	655.9
	[640.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	632.2	486.4	487.6	605.0	604.9
	[603.0, 714.0]	[604.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[350.0, 644.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 37 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

Table 42: Class of 2026 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	68.2	28.3	42.9	56.6	63.8
African American	7.0	4.3	36.6	26.0	12.2	8.1
Hispanic	10.5	9.9	19.1	17.7	12.0	11.3
Asian American	15.6	13.7	11.3	9.7	14.9	13.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.9	0.7	0.8	1.7	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	21.7	40.3	81.3	19.5	32.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.7	9.3	8.9	9.9	9.6
First Generation College	3.2	5.6	15.7	20.2	5.4	8.1
Attended Private HS	21.8	21.8	21.3	19.9	21.7	21.4
% FRPL of HS	22.7	23.4	25.2	26.0	23.1	23.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.4	0.4	0.4	4.0	3.7
SAT Math score	686.1	682.3	564.5	573.9	665.0	663.5
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	675.5	569.9	574.8	660.1	658.1
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	633.2	444.9	453.6	604.0	602.1
	[618.0, 714.0]	[610.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[323.0, 612.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 38 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

9 Combined Simulation 8 by year

Table 43: Class of 2023 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	69.5	40.3	51.1	59.5	62.5
African American	6.8	4.6	29.9	14.4	11.2	8.3
Hispanic	10.8	10.5	19.1	20.0	12.3	14.1
Asian American	14.9	11.8	5.1	10.1	13.0	11.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.9	4.4	3.5	2.6	2.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.0	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	22.1	45.3	89.2	21.3	47.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.3	8.1	8.0	9.5	8.8
First Generation College	2.6	5.1	11.6	12.5	4.3	7.9
Attended Private HS	25.8	25.0	20.4	16.1	24.8	21.6
% FRPL of HS	21.8	24.0	31.4	31.4	23.7	26.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.8	7.6	3.1	11.8	9.1
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.5	1.4	1.4	4.5	3.3
SAT Math score	715.1	715.4	584.8	612.9	690.3	676.3
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 780.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[550.0, 670.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	715.9	599.6	622.1	692.5	680.1
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 790.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[570.0, 680.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	596.9	421.6	448.2	551.9	540.2
	[470.0, 694.0]	[503.0, 695.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[323.0, 622.0]		
N	1,099	840	259	518	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

Table 44: Class of 2024 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	70.8	38.2	51.3	61.2	64.1
African American	6.8	4.5	31.0	15.4	11.0	8.3
Hispanic	10.3	10.4	20.4	20.4	12.0	13.8
Asian American	13.1	10.7	6.3	9.3	11.9	10.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.2	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.3	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	18.1	38.7	75.6	17.6	37.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.0	8.3	8.1	9.4	8.7
First Generation College	2.3	4.2	13.6	14.8	4.2	7.8
Attended Private HS	23.4	22.1	22.9	20.1	23.3	21.4
% FRPL of HS	22.9	25.0	30.7	29.8	24.2	26.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	13.9	8.6	3.8	13.6	10.4
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.6	1.6	1.9	5.3	4.4
SAT Math score	711.0	712.8	574.6	607.4	687.6	676.6
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 780.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[560.0, 660.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	714.3	588.9	616.0	690.6	680.6
	[660.0, 770.0]	[670.0, 790.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[560.0, 680.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	599.7	420.5	446.1	556.6	546.9
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[323.0, 597.0]		
N	1,173	930	243	486	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

Table 45: Class of 2025 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	69.4	34.2	55.2	57.9	64.0
African American	5.8	3.3	31.8	15.9	10.7	8.1
Hispanic	11.4	10.4	21.4	15.0	13.3	12.2
Asian American	16.5	13.9	8.5	10.6	15.0	12.6
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.7	3.5	2.2	2.1	1.9
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.3	0.7	1.2	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	21.7	34.8	60.5	18.4	36.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.8	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.6
First Generation College	2.7	4.2	6.7	7.4	3.4	5.4
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.3	20.4	18.0	22.7	21.3
% FRPL of HS	22.2	23.3	26.1	25.9	22.9	24.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.9	5.0	2.9	11.9	9.8
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.9	0.9	1.4	5.7	4.8
SAT Math score	684.1	685.9	566.9	592.1	662.0	650.5
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 670.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	674.1	576.7	594.0	656.0	643.8
	[640.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[550.0, 670.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	635.6	486.4	509.6	605.0	588.1
	[603.0, 714.0]	[618.0, 714.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[361.0, 665.0]		
N	1,105	848	257	514	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

Table 46: Class of 2026 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	68.7	28.3	49.9	56.6	62.2
African American	7.0	4.3	36.6	19.7	12.2	9.7
Hispanic	10.5	9.5	19.1	16.6	12.0	11.9
Asian American	15.6	13.6	11.3	10.0	14.9	12.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	1.9	4.0	2.5	2.7	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	2.0	0.7	1.2	1.7	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	22.9	40.3	67.1	19.5	38.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.6	9.3	8.9	9.9	9.3
First Generation College	3.2	5.8	15.7	16.6	5.4	9.6
Attended Private HS	21.8	21.5	21.3	19.7	21.7	20.9
% FRPL of HS	22.7	23.8	25.2	25.8	23.1	24.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	11.6	5.1	3.1	11.0	8.7
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.8	0.4	0.8	4.0	3.4
SAT Math score	686.1	686.1	564.5	582.7	665.0	650.3
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	679.8	569.9	586.7	660.1	647.5
	[630.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	643.6	444.9	470.6	604.0	583.6
	[618.0, 714.0]	[628.0, 715.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[337.0, 631.0]		
N	1,155	913	242	484	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

10   Combined Simulation 9 by year

Table 47: Class of 2023 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

| | USNA Non-Prep Admits | | USNA Admits from Prep | | Overall Admits | |
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	65.2	40.3	38.1	59.5	60.1
African American	6.8	5.6	29.9	22.7	11.2	8.8
Hispanic	10.8	14.3	19.1	26.1	12.3	16.6
Asian American	14.9	11.0	5.1	5.9	13.0	10.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.4	4.4	5.7	2.6	3.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	22.2	45.3	87.2	21.3	34.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.3	8.1	7.9	9.5	9.0
First Generation College	2.6	5.4	11.6	15.6	4.3	7.3
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.2	20.4	18.9	24.8	23.2
% FRPL of HS	21.8	24.3	31.4	31.2	23.7	25.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.5	1.4	0.8	4.5	3.8
SAT Math score	715.1	711.1	584.8	577.5	690.3	685.6
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	711.9	599.6	589.9	692.5	688.6
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	591.0	421.6	424.2	551.9	559.2
	[470.0, 694.0]	[489.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[295.0, 584.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 48: Class of 2024 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	66.3	38.2	38.5	61.2	61.5
African American	6.8	5.7	31.0	25.2	11.0	9.1
Hispanic	10.3	13.9	20.4	26.0	12.0	15.9
Asian American	13.1	9.9	6.3	6.6	11.9	9.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	3.1	3.5	3.1	2.9	3.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.6	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	19.1	38.7	81.7	17.6	29.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.1	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.9
First Generation College	2.3	4.8	13.6	19.8	4.2	7.4
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.5	22.9	20.8	23.3	21.3
% FRPL of HS	22.9	25.3	30.7	32.2	24.2	26.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.5	1.6	1.5	5.3	4.8
SAT Math score	711.0	707.7	574.6	573.1	687.6	684.6
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	709.6	588.9	582.8	690.6	687.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	593.3	420.5	429.1	556.6	565.1
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[296.0, 581.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 49: Class of 2025 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	65.0	34.2	43.8	57.9	61.0
African American	5.8	4.3	31.8	23.4	10.7	7.9
Hispanic	11.4	14.2	21.4	21.6	13.3	15.6
Asian American	16.5	13.3	8.5	7.9	15.0	12.3
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	2.2	3.5	2.5	2.1	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.7	0.8	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	21.7	34.8	80.5	18.4	32.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.9	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.8
First Generation College	2.7	4.6	6.7	10.2	3.4	5.7
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.6	20.4	18.5	22.7	22.6
% FRPL of HS	22.2	23.3	26.1	26.6	22.9	23.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.4	0.9	0.6	5.7	5.3
SAT Math score	684.1	681.2	566.9	580.6	662.0	662.2
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	670.7	576.7	580.4	656.0	653.6
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	632.5	486.4	482.7	605.0	604.2
	[603.0, 714.0]	[608.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 638.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 50: Class of 2026 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	64.0	28.3	35.1	56.6	59.0
African American	7.0	5.6	36.6	30.1	12.2	9.8
Hispanic	10.5	13.2	19.1	22.1	12.0	14.8
Asian American	15.6	12.7	11.3	8.3	14.9	12.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.6	4.0	3.7	2.7	2.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	0.7	1.7	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	23.0	40.3	81.3	19.5	33.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.6	9.3	9.0	9.9	9.5
First Generation College	3.2	6.1	15.7	21.7	5.4	8.8
Attended Private HS	21.8	21.9	21.3	20.2	21.7	21.6
% FRPL of HS	22.7	23.7	25.2	26.1	23.1	24.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.5	0.4	0.3	4.0	3.7
SAT Math score	686.1	681.2	564.5	567.7	665.0	661.5
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	674.8	569.9	568.5	660.1	656.4
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	633.6	444.9	444.9	604.0	600.9
	[618.0, 714.0]	[612.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[318.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

40

11   Combined Simulation 10 by year

Table 51: Class of 2023 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	61.5	40.3	33.5	59.5	56.1
African American	6.8	6.3	29.9	24.2	11.2	9.7
Hispanic	10.8	17.6	19.1	29.7	12.3	19.9
Asian American	14.9	10.3	5.1	5.0	13.0	9.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	3.0	4.4	6.1	2.6	3.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	23.3	45.3	87.1	21.3	35.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.2	8.1	8.0	9.5	9.0
First Generation College	2.6	5.8	11.6	16.6	4.3	7.8
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.1	20.4	19.3	24.8	23.2
% FRPL of HS	21.8	24.6	31.4	31.2	23.7	25.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.4	1.4	0.7	4.5	3.7
SAT Math score	715.1	710.7	584.8	574.0	690.3	684.7
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	711.4	599.6	586.7	692.5	687.6
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	593.3	421.6	419.5	551.9	560.1
	[470.0, 694.0]	[492.0, 695.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[288.0, 572.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 52: Class of 2024 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	62.4	38.2	33.8	61.2	57.5
African American	6.8	6.6	31.0	27.3	11.0	10.1
Hispanic	10.3	16.9	20.4	29.2	12.0	19.0
Asian American	13.1	9.3	6.3	5.8	11.9	8.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	3.8	3.5	3.4	2.9	3.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.0	0.5	0.5	1.0	0.9
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	20.2	38.7	81.7	17.6	30.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.0	8.3	7.9	9.4	8.9
First Generation College	2.3	5.4	13.6	21.0	4.2	8.1
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.2	22.9	21.0	23.3	21.1
% FRPL of HS	22.9	25.8	30.7	32.5	24.2	27.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.4	1.6	1.4	5.3	4.7
SAT Math score	711.0	707.5	574.6	568.9	687.6	683.7
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	709.6	588.9	578.3	690.6	687.0
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	595.2	420.5	429.0	556.6	566.7
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[292.0, 581.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 53: Class of 2025 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	61.8	34.2	38.5	57.9	57.4
African American	5.8	4.8	31.8	25.5	10.7	8.7
Hispanic	11.4	17.2	21.4	25.8	13.3	18.8
Asian American	16.5	12.5	8.5	6.6	15.0	11.4
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	2.6	3.5	2.9	2.1	2.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.7	0.7	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	23.0	34.8	80.5	18.4	33.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.9	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.7
First Generation College	2.7	5.0	6.7	11.0	3.4	6.1
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.7	20.4	19.1	22.7	22.8
% FRPL of HS	22.2	23.6	26.1	26.4	22.9	24.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.4	0.9	0.5	5.7	5.3
SAT Math score	684.1	679.9	566.9	575.8	662.0	660.3
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	669.2	576.7	577.0	656.0	651.8
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	632.7	486.4	479.6	605.0	603.8
	[603.0, 714.0]	[610.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 636.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 54: Class of 2026 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	60.5	28.3	29.6	56.6	55.2
African American	7.0	6.6	36.6	33.2	12.2	11.2
Hispanic	10.5	16.1	19.1	25.2	12.0	17.7
Asian American	15.6	12.0	11.3	7.3	14.9	11.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	3.2	4.0	4.2	2.7	3.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.7	0.7	0.5	1.7	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	24.2	40.3	81.3	19.5	34.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.6	9.3	9.1	9.9	9.5
First Generation College	3.2	6.6	15.7	22.5	5.4	9.3
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.0	21.3	20.4	21.7	21.7
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.0	25.2	26.0	23.1	24.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.5	0.4	0.2	4.0	3.8
SAT Math score	686.1	680.2	564.5	563.4	665.0	659.9
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	674.1	569.9	563.9	660.1	655.0
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	633.9	444.9	437.4	604.0	599.8
	[618.0, 714.0]	[612.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[314.0, 594.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

43

12   Combined Simulation 11 by year

Table 55: Class of 2023 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	55.4	40.3	27.6	59.5	50.1
African American	6.8	7.4	29.9	26.1	11.2	11.0
Hispanic	10.8	22.8	19.1	34.5	12.3	25.1
Asian American	14.9	9.1	5.1	3.9	13.0	8.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	3.9	4.4	6.7	2.6	4.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	25.2	45.3	87.1	21.3	37.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.2	8.1	8.1	9.5	9.0
First Generation College	2.6	6.4	11.6	18.1	4.3	8.6
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.0	20.4	20.1	24.8	23.3
% FRPL of HS	21.8	25.2	31.4	30.8	23.7	26.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.1	1.4	0.5	4.5	3.4
SAT Math score	715.1	710.3	584.8	569.5	690.3	683.4
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	710.6	599.6	582.6	692.5	686.2
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	597.1	421.6	411.1	551.9	561.7
	[470.0, 694.0]	[506.0, 697.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[287.0, 543.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 56: Class of 2024 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	56.2	38.2	27.7	61.2	51.3
African American	6.8	7.9	31.0	30.3	11.0	11.7
Hispanic	10.3	21.8	20.4	33.1	12.0	23.7
Asian American	13.1	8.3	6.3	4.7	11.9	7.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	4.9	3.5	3.8	2.9	4.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	0.9	0.5	0.4	1.0	0.8
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	22.0	38.7	81.7	17.6	32.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.0	8.3	7.9	9.4	8.8
First Generation College	2.3	6.3	13.6	22.7	4.2	9.1
Attended Private HS	23.4	20.7	22.9	21.3	23.3	20.8
% FRPL of HS	22.9	26.7	30.7	32.7	24.2	27.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.2	1.6	1.2	5.3	4.5
SAT Math score	711.0	707.1	574.6	563.1	687.6	682.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 600.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	709.6	588.9	572.2	690.6	686.0
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	598.1	420.5	428.7	556.6	569.1
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[290.0, 597.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 57: Class of 2025 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	56.5	34.2	31.2	57.9	51.7
African American	5.8	5.6	31.8	28.2	10.7	9.8
Hispanic	11.4	22.2	21.4	31.7	13.3	24.0
Asian American	16.5	11.4	8.5	5.0	15.0	10.2
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	3.4	3.5	3.3	2.1	3.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.0	0.7	0.6	1.0	0.9
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	25.3	34.8	80.5	18.4	35.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.7	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.6
First Generation College	2.7	5.7	6.7	11.7	3.4	6.8
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.7	20.4	20.0	22.7	23.0
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.1	26.1	26.0	22.9	24.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.4	0.9	0.3	5.7	5.2
SAT Math score	684.1	678.0	566.9	569.5	662.0	657.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	667.0	576.7	572.6	656.0	649.2
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	632.9	486.4	476.5	605.0	603.4
	[603.0, 714.0]	[610.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 633.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Table 58: Class of 2026 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	54.9	28.3	22.6	56.6	49.3
African American	7.0	8.2	36.6	37.7	12.2	13.3
Hispanic	10.5	20.8	19.1	28.7	12.0	22.1
Asian American	15.6	10.7	11.3	5.8	14.9	9.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	3.9	4.0	4.8	2.7	4.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.5	0.7	0.3	1.7	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	26.1	40.3	81.3	19.5	35.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.5	9.3	9.1	9.9	9.4
First Generation College	3.2	7.2	15.7	23.3	5.4	10.0
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.2	21.3	20.7	21.7	21.9
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.5	25.2	25.8	23.1	24.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.6	0.4	0.1	4.0	3.8
SAT Math score	686.1	678.5	564.5	557.8	665.0	657.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 590.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	673.1	569.9	557.8	660.1	653.1
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[510.0, 610.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	634.4	444.9	425.1	604.0	598.2
	[618.0, 714.0]	[616.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[303.0, 559.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

13   Combined Simulation 12 by year

Table 59: Class of 2023 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	68.3	40.3	44.4	59.5	63.7
African American	6.8	4.8	29.9	20.1	11.2	7.8
Hispanic	10.8	11.1	19.1	21.5	12.3	13.1
Asian American	14.9	12.3	5.1	7.0	13.0	11.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.0	4.4	5.1	2.6	2.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.8	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	28.1	45.3	87.2	21.3	39.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.2	8.1	7.9	9.5	9.0
First Generation College	2.6	5.8	11.6	14.9	4.3	7.6
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.0	20.4	19.8	24.8	23.2
% FRPL of HS	21.8	24.6	31.4	30.3	23.7	25.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.3	1.4	0.8	4.5	3.6
SAT Math score	715.1	711.2	584.8	580.0	690.3	686.2
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	712.0	599.6	591.5	692.5	689.0
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	591.3	421.6	421.4	551.9	558.9
	[470.0, 694.0]	[489.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[290.0, 567.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 60: Class of 2024 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	69.5	38.2	44.2	61.2	65.1
African American	6.8	4.9	31.0	22.9	11.0	8.0
Hispanic	10.3	11.2	20.4	21.4	12.0	12.9
Asian American	13.1	11.0	6.3	8.2	11.9	10.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.6	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	24.0	38.7	81.7	17.6	33.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.0	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.9
First Generation College	2.3	5.2	13.6	20.0	4.2	7.7
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.3	22.9	21.2	23.3	21.3
% FRPL of HS	22.9	25.5	30.7	31.4	24.2	26.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.3	1.6	1.6	5.3	4.7
SAT Math score	711.0	706.9	574.6	572.0	687.6	683.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	708.9	588.9	582.3	690.6	687.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	592.9	420.5	423.8	556.6	563.9
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[292.0, 567.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 61: Class of 2025 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	67.6	34.2	48.1	57.9	63.9
African American	5.8	3.7	31.8	21.2	10.7	7.0
Hispanic	11.4	11.4	21.4	18.9	13.3	12.8
Asian American	16.5	14.6	8.5	8.8	15.0	13.5
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.6	3.5	2.1	2.1	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	27.4	34.8	80.5	18.4	37.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.9	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.7
First Generation College	2.7	4.9	6.7	9.3	3.4	5.7
Attended Private HS	23.3	22.9	20.4	18.8	22.7	22.1
% FRPL of HS	22.2	23.5	26.1	26.3	22.9	24.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.2	0.9	0.6	5.7	5.1
SAT Math score	684.1	682.1	566.9	583.4	662.0	663.5
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	670.9	576.7	582.3	656.0	654.2
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	632.0	486.4	480.2	605.0	603.4
	[603.0, 714.0]	[608.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[348.0, 636.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 62: Class of 2026 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	66.9	28.3	39.4	56.6	62.1
African American	7.0	4.7	36.6	27.9	12.2	8.7
Hispanic	10.5	10.3	19.1	18.4	12.0	11.7
Asian American	15.6	14.3	11.3	10.3	14.9	13.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	1.9	4.0	3.3	2.7	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	0.7	1.7	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	29.3	40.3	81.3	19.5	38.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.6	9.3	9.1	9.9	9.5
First Generation College	3.2	6.7	15.7	21.5	5.4	9.2
Attended Private HS	21.8	21.4	21.3	20.4	21.7	21.2
% FRPL of HS	22.7	23.8	25.2	25.6	23.1	24.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.2	0.4	0.2	4.0	3.5
SAT Math score	686.1	681.0	564.5	571.2	665.0	662.0
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	674.3	569.9	571.4	660.1	656.4
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	633.1	444.9	443.5	604.0	600.3
	[618.0, 714.0]	[610.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[315.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

49

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

14   Combined Simulation 13 by year

Table 63: Class of 2023 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	67.2	40.3	44.3	59.5	62.8
African American	6.8	5.0	29.9	19.9	11.2	7.8
Hispanic	10.8	11.6	19.1	21.8	12.3	13.5
Asian American	14.9	12.7	5.1	6.9	13.0	11.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.1	4.4	5.1	2.6	2.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.4	1.2	2.1	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	34.0	45.3	87.1	21.3	44.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.1	8.1	8.0	9.5	8.9
First Generation College	2.6	6.5	11.6	15.3	4.3	8.2
Attended Private HS	25.8	23.7	20.4	20.8	24.8	23.1
% FRPL of HS	21.8	25.2	31.4	29.7	23.7	26.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.0	1.4	0.7	4.5	3.3
SAT Math score	715.1	711.1	584.8	578.9	690.3	685.9
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	711.7	599.6	589.6	692.5	688.4
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	593.9	421.6	414.2	551.9	559.6
	[470.0, 694.0]	[503.0, 695.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[288.0, 543.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 64: Class of 2024 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	68.3	38.2	43.5	61.2	64.1
African American	6.8	5.1	31.0	23.5	11.0	8.3
Hispanic	10.3	11.8	20.4	21.3	12.0	13.5
Asian American	13.1	11.3	6.3	8.5	11.9	10.8
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.5	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	29.1	38.7	81.7	17.6	38.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.0	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.8
First Generation College	2.3	6.0	13.6	21.1	4.2	8.6
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.0	22.9	21.8	23.3	21.1
% FRPL of HS	22.9	26.1	30.7	31.2	24.2	26.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.1	1.6	1.7	5.3	4.5
SAT Math score	711.0	706.1	574.6	567.5	687.6	682.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	708.4	588.9	577.9	690.6	686.0
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	594.3	420.5	418.5	556.6	564.2
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[290.0, 565.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 65: Class of 2025 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	66.6	34.2	46.4	57.9	62.8
African American	5.8	3.7	31.8	21.5	10.7	7.1
Hispanic	11.4	12.0	21.4	20.3	13.3	13.5
Asian American	16.5	15.0	8.5	8.6	15.0	13.8
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.6	3.5	2.1	2.1	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	33.4	34.8	80.5	18.4	42.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.8	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.7
First Generation College	2.7	5.4	6.7	9.1	3.4	6.1
Attended Private HS	23.3	22.4	20.4	19.5	22.7	21.8
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.1	26.1	25.9	22.9	24.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.9	0.9	0.4	5.7	4.9
SAT Math score	684.1	681.6	566.9	580.9	662.0	662.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	669.8	576.7	580.3	656.0	652.9
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	631.9	486.4	474.5	605.0	602.2
	[603.0, 714.0]	[608.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[348.0, 632.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 66: Class of 2026 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	65.8	28.3	37.2	56.6	60.9
African American	7.0	5.0	36.6	29.2	12.2	9.2
Hispanic	10.5	10.7	19.1	18.7	12.0	12.1
Asian American	15.6	14.9	11.3	10.9	14.9	14.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	1.7	4.0	3.4	2.7	2.0
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	0.6	1.7	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	35.5	40.3	81.3	19.5	43.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.5	9.3	9.2	9.9	9.4
First Generation College	3.2	7.5	15.7	22.4	5.4	10.1
Attended Private HS	21.8	21.0	21.3	20.7	21.7	21.0
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.1	25.2	25.3	23.1	24.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.9	0.4	0.2	4.0	3.3
SAT Math score	686.1	680.1	564.5	569.8	665.0	661.0
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	673.4	569.9	569.4	660.1	655.4
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	633.3	444.9	434.5	604.0	598.8
	[618.0, 714.0]	[610.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[310.0, 581.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

15   Combined Simulation 14 by year

Table 67: Class of 2023 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	65.7	40.3	44.1	59.5	61.6
African American	6.8	5.2	29.9	19.5	11.2	7.9
Hispanic	10.8	12.2	19.1	22.2	12.3	14.1
Asian American	14.9	13.3	5.1	6.6	13.0	12.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.3	4.4	5.0	2.6	2.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.3	1.2	2.5	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	43.2	45.3	87.1	21.3	51.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.9	8.1	8.1	9.5	8.7
First Generation College	2.6	7.5	11.6	15.8	4.3	9.1
Attended Private HS	25.8	23.3	20.4	22.1	24.8	23.1
% FRPL of HS	21.8	26.0	31.4	28.7	23.7	26.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.5	1.4	0.6	4.5	2.9
SAT Math score	715.1	711.3	584.8	577.8	690.3	685.8
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	711.4	599.6	587.1	692.5	687.7
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	598.5	421.6	404.0	551.9	561.4
	[470.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[287.0, 511.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 68: Class of 2024 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	66.5	38.2	42.3	61.2	62.4
African American	6.8	5.4	31.0	24.6	11.0	8.7
Hispanic	10.3	12.9	20.4	21.1	12.0	14.3
Asian American	13.1	11.7	6.3	8.9	11.9	11.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.4	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	37.3	38.7	81.7	17.6	44.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.8	8.3	8.1	9.4	8.7
First Generation College	2.3	7.3	13.6	22.2	4.2	9.8
Attended Private HS	23.4	20.4	22.9	22.4	23.3	20.7
% FRPL of HS	22.9	27.1	30.7	30.6	24.2	27.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.9	1.6	1.7	5.3	4.3
SAT Math score	711.0	704.8	574.6	561.7	687.6	680.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 600.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	707.8	588.9	572.3	690.6	684.6
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	596.6	420.5	411.4	556.6	564.8
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[288.0, 546.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 69: Class of 2025 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	64.9	34.2	44.7	57.9	61.1
African American	5.8	3.8	31.8	21.3	10.7	7.1
Hispanic	11.4	13.0	21.4	22.0	13.3	14.7
Asian American	16.5	15.6	8.5	8.9	15.0	14.4
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.6	3.5	2.2	2.1	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	43.0	34.8	80.5	18.4	50.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.6	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.5
First Generation College	2.7	6.3	6.7	8.5	3.4	6.7
Attended Private HS	23.3	21.5	20.4	20.3	22.7	21.2
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.9	26.1	25.5	22.9	25.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.5	0.9	0.2	5.7	4.5
SAT Math score	684.1	681.1	566.9	578.4	662.0	661.7
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	668.2	576.7	579.0	656.0	651.4
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	631.7	486.4	466.8	605.0	600.6
	[603.0, 714.0]	[610.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[342.0, 624.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 70: Class of 2026 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	64.3	28.3	34.8	56.6	59.2
African American	7.0	5.4	36.6	31.0	12.2	9.9
Hispanic	10.5	11.1	19.1	18.9	12.0	12.5
Asian American	15.6	15.9	11.3	11.6	14.9	15.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	1.5	4.0	3.3	2.7	1.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.7	0.7	0.4	1.7	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	45.1	40.3	81.3	19.5	51.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.3	9.3	9.2	9.9	9.3
First Generation College	3.2	8.7	15.7	23.8	5.4	11.3
Attended Private HS	21.8	20.4	21.3	21.1	21.7	20.5
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.7	25.2	25.0	23.1	24.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.5	0.4	0.1	4.0	2.9
SAT Math score	686.1	679.0	564.5	567.7	665.0	659.7
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	672.3	569.9	566.4	660.1	654.0
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	633.9	444.9	421.5	604.0	597.2
	[618.0, 714.0]	[613.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[301.0, 555.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

55

Simulations with 0.75 x Black Coefficient

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Table of Contents

List of Tables

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

1 Simulations for all years together

Table 1: Pooled Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	70.9	35.1	52.1	58.0	67.4
African American	6.8	3.9	32.4	20.5	11.5	6.9
Hispanic	11.0	9.2	20.0	16.3	12.6	10.5
Asian American	15.4	12.5	7.9	6.7	14.0	11.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	1.9	3.8	3.0	2.6	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.6	0.8	1.3	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	12.8	39.7	36.8	18.8	17.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	10.0	8.7	8.8	9.8	9.8
First Generation College	2.9	2.5	11.9	11.0	4.6	4.1
Attended Private HS	23.7	24.0	21.2	21.7	23.3	23.6
% FRPL of HS	22.4	22.1	28.3	27.6	23.5	23.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.9	1.1	1.2	4.9	5.0
SAT Math score	695.6	697.3	572.5	582.3	673.1	676.2
	[640.0, 760.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	692.5	583.4	592.7	671.0	674.2
	[640.0, 740.0]	[650.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	619.0	443.7	452.3	585.0	588.5
	[574.0, 707.0]	[583.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[320.0, 624.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Table 2: Pooled Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 0.75x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	68.6	35.1	46.7	58.0	64.6
African American	6.8	4.4	32.4	21.7	11.5	7.6
Hispanic	11.0	10.3	20.0	19.7	12.6	12.0
Asian American	15.4	13.1	7.9	7.6	14.0	12.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.1	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	21.0	39.7	58.9	18.8	27.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.8	8.7	8.6	9.8	9.6
First Generation College	2.9	5.5	11.9	21.9	4.6	8.5
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.5	21.2	20.4	23.3	22.9
% FRPL of HS	22.4	22.8	28.3	29.3	23.5	24.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.4	1.1	0.7	4.9	4.6
SAT Math score	695.6	693.1	572.5	575.9	673.1	671.7
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	688.3	583.4	583.5	671.0	669.1
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	615.1	443.7	447.4	585.0	584.4
	[574.0, 707.0]	[567.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[318.0, 620.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 1 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to .75 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 3: Pooled Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	68.2	35.1	46.8	58.0	64.3
African American	6.8	4.6	32.4	21.7	11.5	7.7
Hispanic	11.0	10.4	20.0	19.6	12.6	12.1
Asian American	15.4	13.3	7.9	7.7	14.0	12.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	1.9	3.8	3.0	2.6	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	21.5	39.7	59.3	18.8	28.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.6	8.7	8.4	9.8	9.4
First Generation College	2.9	5.7	11.9	21.9	4.6	8.7
Attended Private HS	23.7	18.6	21.2	16.9	23.3	18.3
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.0	28.3	30.5	23.5	26.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.2	1.1	0.7	4.9	4.4
SAT Math score	695.6	692.1	572.5	575.9	673.1	670.9
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	687.0	583.4	583.3	671.0	668.0
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	615.9	443.7	448.9	585.0	585.3
	[574.0, 707.0]	[571.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[320.0, 622.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 2 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .375 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .375 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 4: Pooled Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	68.2	35.1	46.8	58.0	64.3
African American	6.8	4.5	32.4	21.7	11.5	7.7
Hispanic	11.0	10.5	20.0	19.6	12.6	12.1
Asian American	15.4	13.3	7.9	7.7	14.0	12.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	1.9	3.8	3.0	2.6	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	21.6	39.7	59.2	18.8	28.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.6	8.7	8.4	9.8	9.4
First Generation College	2.9	5.7	11.9	21.9	4.6	8.7
Attended Private HS	23.7	18.5	21.2	16.9	23.3	18.2
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.0	28.3	30.5	23.5	26.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.6	1.1	0.9	4.9	3.9
SAT Math score	695.6	692.0	572.5	575.9	673.1	670.8
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	686.9	583.4	583.3	671.0	667.9
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	615.8	443.7	448.8	585.0	585.3
	[574.0, 707.0]	[571.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[320.0, 622.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 3 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

Table 5: Pooled Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	67.3	35.1	46.2	58.0	63.4
African American	6.8	4.5	32.4	21.1	11.5	7.6
Hispanic	11.0	10.9	20.0	20.3	12.6	12.6
Asian American	15.4	13.6	7.9	8.0	14.0	12.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.1	3.8	3.2	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.6	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	22.9	39.7	61.3	18.8	29.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.3	8.7	8.3	9.8	9.1
First Generation College	2.9	6.0	11.9	22.6	4.6	9.1
Attended Private HS	23.7	17.3	21.2	15.8	23.3	17.0
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.8	28.3	31.2	23.5	26.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	3.2	6.5	0.8	12.2	2.8
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.7	1.1	1.0	4.9	4.0
SAT Math score	695.6	696.2	572.5	577.2	673.1	674.4
	[640.0, 760.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	691.8	583.4	585.7	671.0	672.4
	[640.0, 740.0]	[650.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	626.9	443.7	457.8	585.0	595.9
	[574.0, 707.0]	[604.0, 709.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[325.0, 626.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 4 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

Table 6: Pooled Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	67.9	35.1	46.7	58.0	64.0
African American	6.8	4.7	32.4	21.8	11.5	7.8
Hispanic	11.0	10.9	20.0	19.7	12.6	12.5
Asian American	15.4	13.0	7.9	7.5	14.0	12.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.1	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	22.8	39.7	58.9	18.8	29.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.5	8.7	8.4	9.8	9.3
First Generation College	2.9	6.1	11.9	21.9	4.6	9.0
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.3	21.2	21.4	23.3	22.9
% FRPL of HS	22.4	24.2	28.3	28.8	23.5	25.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.2	1.1	0.7	4.9	4.4
SAT Math score	695.6	689.8	572.5	575.0	673.1	668.8
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	685.6	583.4	582.8	671.0	666.8
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	614.8	443.7	446.9	585.0	584.0
	[574.0, 707.0]	[567.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[318.0, 620.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 3 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.375 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 7: Pooled Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	67.9	35.1	45.8	58.0	63.9
African American	6.8	4.7	32.4	22.3	11.5	7.9
Hispanic	11.0	10.9	20.0	19.1	12.6	12.4
Asian American	15.4	13.0	7.9	8.6	14.0	12.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.1	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.0	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	22.8	39.7	82.6	18.8	33.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.5	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.3
First Generation College	2.9	6.1	11.9	15.5	4.6	7.9
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.3	21.2	19.2	23.3	22.5
% FRPL of HS	22.4	24.2	28.3	28.8	23.5	25.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.2	1.1	0.9	4.9	4.4
SAT Math score	695.6	689.8	572.5	580.5	673.1	669.8
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	685.6	583.4	585.7	671.0	667.3
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	614.8	443.7	450.2	585.0	584.6
	[574.0, 707.0]	[567.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[323.0, 620.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 6 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

Table 8: Pooled Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	67.9	35.1	51.8	58.0	62.0
African American	6.8	4.6	32.4	16.1	11.5	8.8
Hispanic	11.0	10.9	20.0	18.3	12.6	13.6
Asian American	15.4	13.1	7.9	9.9	14.0	11.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	2.8	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.6	0.8	1.0	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	24.6	39.7	74.7	18.8	43.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.3	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.0
First Generation College	2.9	6.6	11.9	12.9	4.6	8.9
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.3	21.2	18.4	23.3	21.5
% FRPL of HS	22.4	24.6	28.3	28.6	23.5	26.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.4	6.5	3.3	12.2	9.7
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.4	1.1	1.4	4.9	3.9
SAT Math score	695.6	693.2	572.5	600.6	673.1	659.3
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[540.0, 660.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	688.5	583.4	607.0	671.0	658.7
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[550.0, 670.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	621.8	443.7	465.2	585.0	564.4
	[574.0, 707.0]	[591.0, 709.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[332.0, 631.0]		
N	5,642	4,378	1,264	2,528	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

Table 9: Pooled Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	63.4	35.1	38.9	58.0	58.9
African American	6.8	5.8	32.4	25.4	11.5	9.4
Hispanic	11.0	14.6	20.0	23.9	12.6	16.3
Asian American	15.4	12.1	7.9	7.2	14.0	11.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.7	3.8	3.7	2.6	2.9
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.4	0.8	0.9	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	24.5	39.7	82.6	18.8	35.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.4	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.2
First Generation College	2.9	6.9	11.9	16.9	4.6	8.7
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.2	21.2	19.6	23.3	22.5
% FRPL of HS	22.4	24.7	28.3	28.9	23.5	25.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.1	1.1	0.8	4.9	4.3
SAT Math score	695.6	688.4	572.5	574.6	673.1	667.6
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	684.4	583.4	580.1	671.0	665.3
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	615.6	443.7	445.5	585.0	584.4
	[574.0, 707.0]	[570.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[318.0, 613.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

10

Table 10: Pooled Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	59.6	35.1	33.8	58.0	54.9
African American	6.8	6.6	32.4	27.7	11.5	10.5
Hispanic	11.0	17.8	20.0	27.4	12.6	19.6
Asian American	15.4	11.4	7.9	6.2	14.0	10.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	3.2	3.8	4.1	2.6	3.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.3	0.8	0.8	1.3	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	26.1	39.7	82.6	18.8	36.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.3	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.2
First Generation College	2.9	7.6	11.9	17.8	4.6	9.5
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.1	21.2	20.0	23.3	22.5
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.1	28.3	28.9	23.5	25.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.0	1.1	0.7	4.9	4.2
SAT Math score	695.6	687.2	572.5	570.4	673.1	665.8
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	683.3	583.4	576.2	671.0	663.7
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	616.3	443.7	441.6	585.0	584.3
	[574.0, 707.0]	[572.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[314.0, 610.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 11: Pooled Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	53.5	35.1	27.2	58.0	48.7
African American	6.8	8.0	32.4	30.7	11.5	12.1
Hispanic	11.0	23.0	20.0	31.9	12.6	24.7
Asian American	15.4	10.2	7.9	4.9	14.0	9.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	4.1	3.8	4.6	2.6	4.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.2	0.8	0.6	1.3	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	28.8	39.7	82.6	18.8	38.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.2	8.7	8.6	9.8	9.1
First Generation College	2.9	8.8	11.9	19.0	4.6	10.7
Attended Private HS	23.7	22.9	21.2	20.5	23.3	22.5
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.8	28.3	28.7	23.5	26.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.8	1.1	0.5	4.9	4.0
SAT Math score	695.6	685.4	572.5	564.8	673.1	663.3
	[640.0, 760.0]	[630.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	681.6	583.4	571.0	671.0	661.4
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	617.6	443.7	435.5	585.0	584.2
	[574.0, 707.0]	[578.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[308.0, 599.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

11

Table 12: Pooled Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	66.3	35.1	44.0	58.0	62.2
African American	6.8	5.0	32.4	23.1	11.5	8.3
Hispanic	11.0	11.7	20.0	20.0	12.6	13.2
Asian American	15.4	13.6	7.9	8.6	14.0	12.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.2	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.4	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	30.8	39.7	82.6	18.8	40.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.3	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.2
First Generation College	2.9	7.4	11.9	16.5	4.6	9.1
Attended Private HS	23.7	22.7	21.2	20.1	23.3	22.2
% FRPL of HS	22.4	24.9	28.3	28.3	23.5	25.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.8	1.1	0.8	4.9	4.1
SAT Math score	695.6	688.3	572.5	576.6	673.1	667.8
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	684.0	583.4	581.7	671.0	665.2
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	614.8	443.7	442.5	585.0	583.3
	[574.0, 707.0]	[567.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[314.0, 608.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 13: Pooled Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	65.0	35.1	42.8	58.0	60.9
African American	6.8	5.2	32.4	23.6	11.5	8.6
Hispanic	11.0	12.3	20.0	20.5	12.6	13.8
Asian American	15.4	14.1	7.9	8.8	14.0	13.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.3	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.4	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	37.4	39.7	82.6	18.8	45.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.2	8.7	8.6	9.8	9.1
First Generation College	2.9	8.6	11.9	17.0	4.6	10.1
Attended Private HS	23.7	22.3	21.2	20.7	23.3	22.0
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.5	28.3	28.0	23.5	25.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.5	1.1	0.7	4.9	3.8
SAT Math score	695.6	687.3	572.5	574.2	673.1	666.6
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	682.8	583.4	579.1	671.0	663.8
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	615.2	443.7	435.7	585.0	582.3
	[574.0, 707.0]	[567.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[308.0, 598.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

12

Table 14: Pooled Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	63.0	35.1	41.4	58.0	59.0
African American	6.8	5.5	32.4	24.2	11.5	8.9
Hispanic	11.0	13.2	20.0	21.0	12.6	14.6
Asian American	15.4	14.9	7.9	9.1	14.0	13.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.1	3.8	3.2	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.3	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	47.4	39.7	82.6	18.8	53.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.1	8.7	8.7	9.8	9.0
First Generation College	2.9	10.3	11.9	17.7	4.6	11.7
Attended Private HS	23.7	21.5	21.2	21.5	23.3	21.5
% FRPL of HS	22.4	26.4	28.3	27.4	23.5	26.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.0	1.1	0.6	4.9	3.4
SAT Math score	695.6	686.1	572.5	571.3	673.1	665.1
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	681.3	583.4	576.0	671.0	662.0
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	616.4	443.7	426.2	585.0	581.6
	[574.0, 707.0]	[571.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[298.0, 581.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

13

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

2   Combined Simulation 1 by year

Table 15: Class of 2023 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	71.5	40.3	56.3	59.5	68.6
African American	6.8	4.3	29.9	17.1	11.2	6.7
Hispanic	10.8	9.3	19.1	16.4	12.3	10.7
Asian American	14.9	11.5	5.1	4.6	13.0	10.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.7	4.4	3.9	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	14.4	45.3	41.1	21.3	19.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.8	8.1	8.1	9.5	9.5
First Generation College	2.6	2.4	11.6	11.1	4.3	4.0
Attended Private HS	25.8	26.2	20.4	21.1	24.8	25.2
% FRPL of HS	21.8	21.5	31.4	30.4	23.7	23.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	5.2	1.4	1.3	4.5	4.5
SAT Math score	715.1	715.6	584.8	593.6	690.3	692.4
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	716.1	599.6	607.3	692.5	695.4
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 790.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[560.0, 660.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	584.2	421.6	428.7	551.9	554.5
	[470.0, 694.0]	[470.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[296.0, 602.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

Table 16: Class of 2024 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	72.8	38.2	52.2	61.2	69.3
African American	6.8	4.4	31.0	20.1	11.0	7.1
Hispanic	10.3	9.0	20.4	18.1	12.0	10.6
Asian American	13.1	10.3	6.3	5.8	11.9	9.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.2	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.3	0.5	0.9	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	12.1	38.7	36.6	17.6	16.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.5	8.3	8.4	9.4	9.3
First Generation College	2.3	1.9	13.6	13.2	4.2	3.9
Attended Private HS	23.4	23.8	22.9	23.4	23.3	23.7
% FRPL of HS	22.9	22.6	30.7	29.9	24.2	23.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	6.0	1.6	2.0	5.3	5.3
SAT Math score	711.0	711.7	574.6	581.4	687.6	689.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	712.8	588.9	596.1	690.6	692.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[670.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	587.3	420.5	426.2	556.6	559.6
	[476.0, 694.0]	[484.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[297.0, 581.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

Table 17: Class of 2025 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	71.1	34.2	53.3	57.9	67.7
African American	5.8	3.1	31.8	19.6	10.7	6.2
Hispanic	11.4	9.3	21.4	16.6	13.3	10.7
Asian American	16.5	13.8	8.5	6.8	15.0	12.5
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.5	3.5	2.5	2.1	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.2	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	13.6	34.8	32.8	18.4	17.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	10.4	9.2	9.3	10.1	10.2
First Generation College	2.7	2.3	6.7	5.6	3.4	2.9
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.6	20.4	20.9	22.7	23.1
% FRPL of HS	22.2	21.9	26.1	25.3	22.9	22.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	7.0	0.9	1.0	5.7	5.8
SAT Math score	684.1	687.3	566.9	581.0	662.0	667.3
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	677.4	576.7	589.7	656.0	660.8
	[640.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	635.3	486.4	497.3	605.0	609.2
	[603.0, 714.0]	[612.0, 714.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[351.0, 663.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

15

Table 18: Class of 2026 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	70.2	28.3	47.1	56.6	66.2
African American	7.0	3.5	36.6	25.0	12.2	7.2
Hispanic	10.5	8.9	19.1	14.4	12.0	9.8
Asian American	15.6	13.2	11.3	9.2	14.9	12.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.1	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	2.0	0.7	1.4	1.7	1.9
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	13.8	40.3	37.0	19.5	17.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	10.0	9.3	9.3	9.9	9.9
First Generation College	3.2	2.8	15.7	13.9	5.4	4.7
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.0	21.3	21.3	21.7	21.9
% FRPL of HS	22.7	22.4	25.2	25.1	23.1	22.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.8	0.4	0.6	4.0	4.1
SAT Math score	686.1	688.4	564.5	574.2	665.0	668.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	681.0	569.9	579.2	660.1	663.3
	[630.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	639.4	444.9	455.4	604.0	607.5
	[618.0, 714.0]	[621.0, 714.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[320.0, 616.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

3   Combined Simulation 2 by year

Table 19: Class of 2023 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 0.75x Boost for Low SES Family

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	69.6	40.3	48.9	59.5	65.6
African American	6.8	4.8	29.9	18.3	11.2	7.4
Hispanic	10.8	10.2	19.1	20.8	12.3	12.2
Asian American	14.9	12.0	5.1	5.8	13.0	10.8
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.9	4.4	4.4	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	22.0	45.3	62.4	21.3	29.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.7	8.1	7.8	9.5	9.3
First Generation College	2.6	5.5	11.6	22.5	4.3	8.7
Attended Private HS	25.8	25.7	20.4	19.1	24.8	24.4
% FRPL of HS	21.8	22.3	31.4	33.2	23.7	24.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.7	1.4	0.8	4.5	4.0
SAT Math score	715.1	712.2	584.8	583.9	690.3	687.7
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	712.8	599.6	596.3	692.5	690.6
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 780.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	582.8	421.6	431.6	551.9	553.9
	[470.0, 694.0]	[470.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[301.0, 618.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 15 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to .75 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 20: Class of 2024 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 0.75x Boost for Low SES Family

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	70.9	38.2	47.4	61.2	66.9
African American	6.8	4.7	31.0	20.9	11.0	7.5
Hispanic	10.3	10.2	20.4	21.4	12.0	12.1
Asian American	13.1	10.7	6.3	6.7	11.9	10.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	18.9	38.7	56.0	17.6	25.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.4	8.3	8.1	9.4	9.2
First Generation College	2.3	4.7	13.6	24.9	4.2	8.1
Attended Private HS	23.4	23.1	22.9	22.7	23.3	23.1
% FRPL of HS	22.9	23.3	30.7	32.0	24.2	24.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.6	1.6	1.4	5.3	4.9
SAT Math score	711.0	708.2	574.6	575.0	687.6	685.4
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	709.6	588.9	587.5	690.6	688.6
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	586.2	420.5	424.6	556.6	558.4
	[476.0, 694.0]	[484.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[296.0, 570.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 16 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to .75 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 21: Class of 2025 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 0.75x Boost for Low SES Family

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	69.0	34.2	49.8	57.9	65.4
African American	5.8	3.6	31.8	20.7	10.7	6.8
Hispanic	11.4	10.5	21.4	17.9	13.3	11.9
Asian American	16.5	14.3	8.5	8.1	15.0	13.1
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.5	3.5	2.4	2.1	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.1	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	21.8	34.8	55.2	18.4	28.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	10.3	9.2	9.2	10.1	10.1
First Generation College	2.7	4.6	6.7	13.4	3.4	6.3
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.2	20.4	20.0	22.7	22.6
% FRPL of HS	22.2	22.4	26.1	26.1	22.9	23.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.6	0.9	0.6	5.7	5.4
SAT Math score	684.1	683.2	566.9	578.4	662.0	663.4
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	672.8	576.7	582.2	656.0	655.7
	[640.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	631.1	486.4	488.4	605.0	604.2
	[603.0, 714.0]	[599.0, 714.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 646.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 17 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to .75 times the coefficient on African American.

18

Table 22: Class of 2026 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 0.75x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	67.9	28.3	41.1	56.6	63.3
African American	7.0	4.3	36.6	26.6	12.2	8.2
Hispanic	10.5	10.1	19.1	18.7	12.0	11.6
Asian American	15.6	13.8	11.3	9.5	14.9	13.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	1.1	1.7	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	23.2	40.3	61.9	19.5	29.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.9	9.3	9.1	9.9	9.8
First Generation College	3.2	6.4	15.7	26.8	5.4	10.0
Attended Private HS	21.8	21.6	21.3	20.0	21.7	21.3
% FRPL of HS	22.7	22.8	25.2	26.2	23.1	23.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.4	0.4	0.3	4.0	3.7
SAT Math score	686.1	682.6	564.5	567.2	665.0	662.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	675.3	569.9	569.1	660.1	656.9
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	632.2	444.9	444.0	604.0	599.6
	[618.0, 714.0]	[606.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[314.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 18 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to .75 times the coefficient on African American.

19

4   Combined Simulation 3 by year

Table 23: Class of 2023 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	69.1	40.3	48.7	59.5	65.3
African American	6.8	4.9	29.9	18.2	11.2	7.5
Hispanic	10.8	10.5	19.1	21.0	12.3	12.5
Asian American	14.9	12.1	5.1	6.1	13.0	11.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.8	4.4	4.3	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	22.8	45.3	62.6	21.3	30.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.4	8.1	7.6	9.5	9.1
First Generation College	2.6	5.8	11.6	23.0	4.3	9.1
Attended Private HS	25.8	19.8	20.4	14.6	24.8	18.8
% FRPL of HS	21.8	25.2	31.4	34.4	23.7	27.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.6	1.4	0.8	4.5	3.8
SAT Math score	715.1	710.6	584.8	584.0	690.3	686.5
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	710.9	599.6	596.2	692.5	689.1
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	586.3	421.6	435.7	551.9	557.6
	[470.0, 694.0]	[476.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[305.0, 622.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 19 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .375 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .375 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 24: Class of 2024 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	70.6	38.2	47.6	61.2	66.6
African American	6.8	4.8	31.0	21.1	11.0	7.6
Hispanic	10.3	10.4	20.4	21.0	12.0	12.2
Asian American	13.1	10.6	6.3	6.7	11.9	10.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.4	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	19.6	38.7	56.1	17.6	25.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.2	8.3	7.9	9.4	8.9
First Generation College	2.3	4.9	13.6	24.3	4.2	8.2
Attended Private HS	23.4	17.6	22.9	17.8	23.3	17.6
% FRPL of HS	22.9	26.0	30.7	33.4	24.2	27.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.3	1.6	1.3	5.3	4.7
SAT Math score	711.0	706.6	574.6	575.6	687.6	684.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	707.7	588.9	587.7	690.6	687.1
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	589.1	420.5	429.5	556.6	561.7
	[476.0, 694.0]	[492.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[298.0, 591.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 20 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .375 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .375 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 25: Class of 2025 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	68.5	34.2	50.1	57.9	65.0
African American	5.8	3.6	31.8	20.8	10.7	6.9
Hispanic	11.4	10.6	21.4	17.5	13.3	11.9
Asian American	16.5	14.7	8.5	8.3	15.0	13.5
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.4	3.5	2.2	2.1	1.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.1	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	22.1	34.8	56.1	18.4	28.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	10.0	9.2	9.0	10.1	9.8
First Generation College	2.7	4.7	6.7	13.2	3.4	6.3
Attended Private HS	23.3	19.2	20.4	17.2	22.7	18.8
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.0	26.1	27.4	22.9	24.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.4	0.9	0.6	5.7	5.3
SAT Math score	684.1	682.5	566.9	577.8	662.0	662.8
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	671.6	576.7	581.7	656.0	654.7
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	630.3	486.4	487.2	605.0	603.3
	[603.0, 714.0]	[599.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 646.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 21 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .375 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .375 times the coefficient on African American.

21

Table 26: Class of 2026 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	67.6	28.3	41.2	56.6	63.1
African American	7.0	4.5	36.6	26.3	12.2	8.2
Hispanic	10.5	10.1	19.1	18.9	12.0	11.6
Asian American	15.6	13.9	11.3	9.4	14.9	13.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	1.2	1.7	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	23.5	40.3	62.3	19.5	30.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.7	9.3	8.9	9.9	9.6
First Generation College	3.2	6.6	15.7	27.1	5.4	10.1
Attended Private HS	21.8	17.6	21.3	17.8	21.7	17.6
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.4	25.2	27.2	23.1	24.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.2	0.4	0.2	4.0	3.5
SAT Math score	686.1	682.1	564.5	566.8	665.0	662.1
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	674.5	569.9	568.8	660.1	656.2
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	631.5	444.9	442.9	604.0	598.8
	[618.0, 714.0]	[603.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[314.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 22 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .375 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .375 times the coefficient on African American.

22

5   Combined Simulation 4 by year

Table 27: Class of 2023 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	69.2	40.3	48.7	59.5	65.3
African American	6.8	4.9	29.9	18.2	11.2	7.4
Hispanic	10.8	10.5	19.1	21.0	12.3	12.5
Asian American	14.9	12.1	5.1	6.2	13.0	10.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.8	4.4	4.3	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	22.8	45.3	62.5	21.3	30.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.4	8.1	7.6	9.5	9.1
First Generation College	2.6	5.8	11.6	22.9	4.3	9.0
Attended Private HS	25.8	19.8	20.4	14.6	24.8	18.8
% FRPL of HS	21.8	25.2	31.4	34.4	23.7	27.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.0	1.4	1.0	4.5	3.4
SAT Math score	715.1	710.6	584.8	584.1	690.3	686.5
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	711.0	599.6	596.2	692.5	689.1
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	586.5	421.6	435.5	551.9	557.7
	[470.0, 694.0]	[476.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[305.0, 622.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 23 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

Table 28: Class of 2024 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	70.6	38.2	47.6	61.2	66.7
African American	6.8	4.8	31.0	21.1	11.0	7.6
Hispanic	10.3	10.4	20.4	21.0	12.0	12.2
Asian American	13.1	10.6	6.3	6.7	11.9	9.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.4	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.9	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	19.6	38.7	56.0	17.6	25.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.1	8.3	7.9	9.4	8.9
First Generation College	2.3	4.9	13.6	24.2	4.2	8.2
Attended Private HS	23.4	17.5	22.9	17.8	23.3	17.6
% FRPL of HS	22.9	26.0	30.7	33.4	24.2	27.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.9	1.6	1.7	5.3	4.3
SAT Math score	711.0	706.6	574.6	575.6	687.6	684.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	707.7	588.9	587.7	690.6	687.1
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	589.1	420.5	429.2	556.6	561.7
	[476.0, 694.0]	[492.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[297.0, 589.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 24 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

Table 29: Class of 2025 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	68.4	34.2	50.1	57.9	65.0
African American	5.8	3.6	31.8	20.7	10.7	6.9
Hispanic	11.4	10.6	21.4	17.5	13.3	11.9
Asian American	16.5	14.7	8.5	8.3	15.0	13.5
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.4	3.5	2.2	2.1	1.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.1	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	22.2	34.8	56.0	18.4	28.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	10.0	9.2	9.0	10.1	9.8
First Generation College	2.7	4.7	6.7	13.2	3.4	6.3
Attended Private HS	23.3	19.2	20.4	17.2	22.7	18.8
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.0	26.1	27.4	22.9	24.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.7	0.9	0.8	5.7	4.8
SAT Math score	684.1	682.3	566.9	577.9	662.0	662.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	671.5	576.7	581.7	656.0	654.6
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	630.1	486.4	487.2	605.0	603.1
	[603.0, 714.0]	[598.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 646.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 25 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

24

Table 30: Class of 2026 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	67.6	28.3	41.2	56.6	63.0
African American	7.0	4.5	36.6	26.3	12.2	8.2
Hispanic	10.5	10.2	19.1	18.9	12.0	11.7
Asian American	15.6	14.0	11.3	9.4	14.9	13.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	1.2	1.7	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	23.6	40.3	62.3	19.5	30.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.7	9.3	8.9	9.9	9.6
First Generation College	3.2	6.6	15.7	27.1	5.4	10.2
Attended Private HS	21.8	17.6	21.3	17.8	21.7	17.6
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.4	25.2	27.2	23.1	24.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.7	0.4	0.2	4.0	3.1
SAT Math score	686.1	682.0	564.5	566.8	665.0	662.0
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	674.4	569.9	568.8	660.1	656.1
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	631.4	444.9	442.9	604.0	598.8
	[618.0, 714.0]	[603.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[314.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 26 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

6 Combined Simulation 5 by year

Table 31: Class of 2023 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	67.8	40.3	47.4	59.5	63.9
African American	6.8	4.9	29.9	17.9	11.2	7.4
Hispanic	10.8	11.1	19.1	22.5	12.3	13.3
Asian American	14.9	12.6	5.1	6.3	13.0	11.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.0	4.4	4.4	2.6	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.7	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	24.3	45.3	64.4	21.3	32.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.1	8.1	7.4	9.5	8.8
First Generation College	2.6	6.3	11.6	23.8	4.3	9.6
Attended Private HS	25.8	18.0	20.4	13.6	24.8	17.2
% FRPL of HS	21.8	26.3	31.4	35.6	23.7	28.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	1.9	7.6	0.5	11.8	1.7
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.3	1.4	1.2	4.5	3.7
SAT Math score	715.1	715.6	584.8	585.2	690.3	690.7
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	716.5	599.6	598.4	692.5	694.0
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 790.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	602.3	421.6	447.3	551.9	572.8
	[470.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[318.0, 626.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 27 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Table 32: Class of 2024 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	69.9	38.2	46.9	61.2	65.9
African American	6.8	4.6	31.0	20.0	11.0	7.2
Hispanic	10.3	10.8	20.4	22.1	12.0	12.8
Asian American	13.1	11.0	6.3	6.9	11.9	10.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.5	3.5	3.0	2.9	2.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.3	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	21.0	38.7	59.2	17.6	27.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.6	8.3	7.6	9.4	8.4
First Generation College	2.3	5.2	13.6	25.6	4.2	8.7
Attended Private HS	23.4	16.6	22.9	15.0	23.3	16.3
% FRPL of HS	22.9	26.9	30.7	34.7	24.2	28.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	3.0	8.6	0.5	13.6	2.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.0	1.6	1.9	5.3	4.5
SAT Math score	711.0	711.6	574.6	576.7	687.6	688.5
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	713.8	588.9	590.6	690.6	692.7
	[660.0, 770.0]	[670.0, 780.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	606.8	420.5	443.5	556.6	578.8
	[476.0, 694.0]	[538.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[313.0, 618.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 28 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

Table 33: Class of 2025 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	68.2	34.2	50.1	57.9	64.7
African American	5.8	3.5	31.8	20.3	10.7	6.7
Hispanic	11.4	10.8	21.4	17.5	13.3	12.1
Asian American	16.5	14.9	8.5	8.7	15.0	13.7
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.5	3.5	2.3	2.1	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.7	1.2	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	23.2	34.8	57.4	18.4	29.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.7	9.2	9.0	10.1	9.6
First Generation College	2.7	5.0	6.7	13.4	3.4	6.6
Attended Private HS	23.3	18.4	20.4	16.8	22.7	18.1
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.6	26.1	27.5	22.9	25.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	3.8	5.0	1.3	11.9	3.3
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.8	0.9	0.9	5.7	4.8
SAT Math score	684.1	687.9	566.9	579.5	662.0	667.4
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	677.6	576.7	583.8	656.0	659.9
	[640.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	639.3	486.4	492.8	605.0	611.7
	[603.0, 714.0]	[621.0, 714.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[356.0, 650.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 29 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

27

Table 34: Class of 2026 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	66.2	28.3	40.7	56.6	61.8
African American	7.0	4.9	36.6	25.9	12.2	8.5
Hispanic	10.5	10.6	19.1	19.2	12.0	12.1
Asian American	15.6	14.3	11.3	9.9	14.9	13.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.1	4.0	3.1	2.7	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.9	0.7	1.3	1.7	1.8
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	24.9	40.3	64.3	19.5	31.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.6	9.3	8.9	9.9	9.5
First Generation College	3.2	7.1	15.7	27.6	5.4	10.6
Attended Private HS	21.8	16.7	21.3	17.5	21.7	16.8
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.0	25.2	27.4	23.1	25.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	3.6	5.1	0.9	11.0	3.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.9	0.4	0.3	4.0	3.3
SAT Math score	686.1	684.1	564.5	568.3	665.0	664.1
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	677.3	569.9	571.4	660.1	658.9
	[630.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	637.6	444.9	447.5	604.0	604.6
	[618.0, 714.0]	[621.0, 714.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[320.0, 603.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 30 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

7   Combined Simulation 6 by year

Table 35: Class of 2023 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	68.9	40.3	49.0	59.5	65.1
African American	6.8	4.8	29.9	18.2	11.2	7.4
Hispanic	10.8	11.1	19.1	20.9	12.3	13.0
Asian American	14.9	11.7	5.1	5.7	13.0	10.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.9	4.4	4.4	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	24.1	45.3	62.9	21.3	31.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.2	8.1	7.6	9.5	8.9
First Generation College	2.6	6.2	11.6	22.6	4.3	9.3
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.5	20.4	20.5	24.8	23.7
% FRPL of HS	21.8	24.5	31.4	32.1	23.7	26.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.4	1.4	0.7	4.5	3.7
SAT Math score	715.1	708.8	584.8	583.1	690.3	684.8
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	710.1	599.6	595.6	692.5	688.3
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	587.3	421.6	431.0	551.9	557.5
	[470.0, 694.0]	[479.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[300.0, 616.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 23 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.375 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 36: Class of 2024 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	70.2	38.2	47.7	61.2	66.4
African American	6.8	4.9	31.0	20.8	11.0	7.6
Hispanic	10.3	10.8	20.4	21.2	12.0	12.6
Asian American	13.1	10.6	6.3	6.7	11.9	10.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	20.6	38.7	56.0	17.6	26.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.0	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.8
First Generation College	2.3	5.3	13.6	25.0	4.2	8.7
Attended Private HS	23.4	22.0	22.9	24.0	23.3	22.3
% FRPL of HS	22.9	25.2	30.7	31.0	24.2	26.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.4	1.6	1.4	5.3	4.7
SAT Math score	711.0	705.5	574.6	574.3	687.6	683.0
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	707.4	588.9	587.3	690.6	686.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	589.6	420.5	422.9	556.6	561.0
	[476.0, 694.0]	[501.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[296.0, 567.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 24 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.375 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 37: Class of 2025 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	68.0	34.2	49.3	57.9	64.5
African American	5.8	3.9	31.8	20.9	10.7	7.1
Hispanic	11.4	11.1	21.4	18.0	13.3	12.4
Asian American	16.5	14.1	8.5	8.1	15.0	13.0
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.7	3.5	2.5	2.1	1.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.2	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	22.9	34.8	54.8	18.4	29.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.9	9.2	9.0	10.1	9.7
First Generation College	2.7	5.0	6.7	13.4	3.4	6.6
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.8	20.4	20.8	22.7	23.2
% FRPL of HS	22.2	23.3	26.1	26.2	22.9	23.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.2	0.9	0.5	5.7	5.1
SAT Math score	684.1	679.9	566.9	577.1	662.0	660.5
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	669.8	576.7	581.0	656.0	653.1
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	629.7	486.4	489.2	605.0	603.2
	[603.0, 714.0]	[598.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 648.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 25 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.375 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 38: Class of 2026 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	67.3	28.3	41.1	56.6	62.8
African American	7.0	4.7	36.6	26.7	12.2	8.5
Hispanic	10.5	10.5	19.1	18.7	12.0	12.0
Asian American	15.6	13.6	11.3	9.4	14.9	12.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.9	0.7	1.0	1.7	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	25.1	40.3	62.1	19.5	31.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.6	9.3	9.0	9.9	9.5
First Generation College	3.2	7.2	15.7	26.7	5.4	10.6
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.0	21.3	20.5	21.7	21.8
% FRPL of HS	22.7	23.7	25.2	26.3	23.1	24.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.3	0.4	0.3	4.0	3.6
SAT Math score	686.1	678.6	564.5	566.2	665.0	659.2
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	672.2	569.9	568.5	660.1	654.2
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	627.9	444.9	443.8	604.0	596.0
	[618.0, 714.0]	[598.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[315.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 26 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.375 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

8   Combined Simulation 7 by year

Table 39: Class of 2023 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	68.9	40.3	44.9	59.5	64.3
African American	6.8	4.8	29.9	20.3	11.2	7.8
Hispanic	10.8	11.1	19.1	21.1	12.3	13.0
Asian American	14.9	11.7	5.1	7.2	13.0	10.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.9	4.4	5.1	2.6	2.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.6	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	24.1	45.3	87.1	21.3	36.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.2	8.1	7.9	9.5	9.0
First Generation College	2.6	6.2	11.6	14.3	4.3	7.7
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.5	20.4	18.5	24.8	23.4
% FRPL of HS	21.8	24.5	31.4	31.1	23.7	25.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.4	1.4	1.0	4.5	3.8
SAT Math score	715.1	708.8	584.8	582.5	690.3	684.7
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	710.1	599.6	594.7	692.5	688.1
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	587.3	421.6	429.1	551.9	557.1
	[470.0, 694.0]	[479.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[301.0, 589.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 35 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

Table 40: Class of 2024 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	70.2	38.2	45.3	61.2	65.9
African American	6.8	4.9	31.0	22.4	11.0	7.9
Hispanic	10.3	10.8	20.4	21.2	12.0	12.6
Asian American	13.1	10.6	6.3	7.8	11.9	10.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.6	2.9	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	20.6	38.7	81.7	17.6	31.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.0	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.8
First Generation College	2.3	5.3	13.6	18.4	4.2	7.6
Attended Private HS	23.4	22.0	22.9	20.6	23.3	21.8
% FRPL of HS	22.9	25.2	30.7	31.6	24.2	26.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.4	1.6	1.5	5.3	4.7
SAT Math score	711.0	705.5	574.6	578.8	687.6	683.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	707.4	588.9	589.0	690.6	687.1
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	589.6	420.5	429.2	556.6	562.1
	[476.0, 694.0]	[501.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[297.0, 570.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 36 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

Table 41: Class of 2025 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	68.0	34.2	50.4	57.9	64.7
African American	5.8	3.9	31.8	20.5	10.7	7.0
Hispanic	11.4	11.1	21.4	16.4	13.3	12.1
Asian American	16.5	14.1	8.5	9.7	15.0	13.3
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.7	3.5	2.0	2.1	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	0.9	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	22.9	34.8	80.5	18.4	33.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.9	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.7
First Generation College	2.7	5.0	6.7	9.1	3.4	5.8
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.8	20.4	17.6	22.7	22.6
% FRPL of HS	22.2	23.3	26.1	26.7	22.9	23.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.2	0.9	0.8	5.7	5.2
SAT Math score	684.1	679.9	566.9	587.2	662.0	662.4
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 660.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	669.8	576.7	585.1	656.0	653.8
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	629.7	486.4	487.6	605.0	602.9
	[603.0, 714.0]	[598.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[350.0, 644.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 37 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Table 42: Class of 2026 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	67.3	28.3	42.9	56.6	63.1
African American	7.0	4.7	36.6	26.0	12.2	8.4
Hispanic	10.5	10.5	19.1	17.7	12.0	11.8
Asian American	15.6	13.6	11.3	9.7	14.9	12.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.9	0.7	0.8	1.7	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	25.1	40.3	81.3	19.5	34.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.6	9.3	8.9	9.9	9.5
First Generation College	3.2	7.2	15.7	20.2	5.4	9.4
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.0	21.3	19.9	21.7	21.7
% FRPL of HS	22.7	23.7	25.2	26.0	23.1	24.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.3	0.4	0.4	4.0	3.6
SAT Math score	686.1	678.6	564.5	573.9	665.0	660.5
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	672.2	569.9	574.8	660.1	655.3
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	627.9	444.9	453.6	604.0	597.7
	[618.0, 714.0]	[598.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[323.0, 612.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 38 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

9   Combined Simulation 8 by year

Table 43: Class of 2023 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	68.6	40.3	51.1	59.5	61.9
African American	6.8	4.8	29.9	14.4	11.2	8.4
Hispanic	10.8	11.2	19.1	20.0	12.3	14.5
Asian American	14.9	11.9	5.1	10.1	13.0	11.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.0	4.4	3.5	2.6	2.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.0	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	25.8	45.3	89.2	21.3	50.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.2	8.1	8.0	9.5	8.7
First Generation College	2.6	6.6	11.6	12.5	4.3	8.9
Attended Private HS	25.8	25.2	20.4	16.1	24.8	21.7
% FRPL of HS	21.8	24.7	31.4	31.4	23.7	27.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.8	7.6	3.1	11.8	9.1
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.3	1.4	1.4	4.5	3.2
SAT Math score	715.1	712.5	584.8	612.9	690.3	674.5
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[550.0, 670.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	713.2	599.6	622.1	692.5	678.5
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 780.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[570.0, 680.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	595.6	421.6	448.2	551.9	539.4
	[470.0, 694.0]	[497.0, 695.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[323.0, 622.0]		
N	1,099	840	259	518	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

Table 44: Class of 2024 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	70.0	38.2	51.3	61.2	63.6
African American	6.8	4.7	31.0	15.4	11.0	8.4
Hispanic	10.3	11.0	20.4	20.4	12.0	14.2
Asian American	13.1	10.8	6.3	9.3	11.9	10.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.2	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	21.3	38.7	75.6	17.6	40.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.9	8.3	8.1	9.4	8.6
First Generation College	2.3	5.5	13.6	14.8	4.2	8.7
Attended Private HS	23.4	22.3	22.9	20.1	23.3	21.6
% FRPL of HS	22.9	25.6	30.7	29.8	24.2	27.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	13.9	8.6	3.8	13.6	10.4
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.4	1.6	1.9	5.3	4.2
SAT Math score	711.0	710.0	574.6	607.4	687.6	674.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[560.0, 660.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	711.9	588.9	616.0	690.6	679.0
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 790.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[560.0, 680.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	598.2	420.5	446.1	556.6	546.0
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[323.0, 597.0]		
N	1,173	930	243	486	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

Table 45: Class of 2025 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	68.3	34.2	55.2	57.9	63.3
African American	5.8	3.6	31.8	15.9	10.7	8.2
Hispanic	11.4	11.1	21.4	15.0	13.3	12.6
Asian American	16.5	14.0	8.5	10.6	15.0	12.7
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.7	3.5	2.2	2.1	1.9
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.3	0.7	1.2	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	25.3	34.8	60.5	18.4	38.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.6	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.5
First Generation College	2.7	5.4	6.7	7.4	3.4	6.1
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.6	20.4	18.0	22.7	21.5
% FRPL of HS	22.2	23.8	26.1	25.9	22.9	24.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.9	5.0	2.9	11.9	9.8
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.6	0.9	1.4	5.7	4.6
SAT Math score	684.1	682.8	566.9	592.1	662.0	648.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 670.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	671.1	576.7	594.0	656.0	642.0
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[550.0, 670.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	633.1	486.4	509.6	605.0	586.5
	[603.0, 714.0]	[613.0, 714.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[361.0, 665.0]		
N	1,105	848	257	514	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

Table 46: Class of 2026 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	67.4	28.3	49.9	56.6	61.3
African American	7.0	4.8	36.6	19.7	12.2	10.0
Hispanic	10.5	10.3	19.1	16.6	12.0	12.5
Asian American	15.6	13.8	11.3	10.0	14.9	12.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	1.9	4.0	2.5	2.7	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.9	0.7	1.2	1.7	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	27.5	40.3	67.1	19.5	41.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.4	9.3	8.9	9.9	9.3
First Generation College	3.2	7.9	15.7	16.6	5.4	10.9
Attended Private HS	21.8	21.8	21.3	19.7	21.7	21.1
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.2	25.2	25.8	23.1	24.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	11.6	5.1	3.1	11.0	8.7
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.5	0.4	0.8	4.0	3.2
SAT Math score	686.1	681.7	564.5	582.7	665.0	647.4
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	675.6	569.9	586.7	660.1	644.8
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	637.9	444.9	470.6	604.0	579.9
	[618.0, 714.0]	[621.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[337.0, 631.0]		
N	1,155	913	242	484	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

37

10   Combined Simulation 9 by year

Table 47: Class of 2023 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	64.3	40.3	38.1	59.5	59.3
African American	6.8	5.8	29.9	22.7	11.2	9.0
Hispanic	10.8	15.0	19.1	26.1	12.3	17.1
Asian American	14.9	10.9	5.1	5.9	13.0	10.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.5	4.4	5.7	2.6	3.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	25.7	45.3	87.2	21.3	37.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.2	8.1	7.9	9.5	8.9
First Generation College	2.6	6.8	11.6	15.6	4.3	8.5
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.4	20.4	18.9	24.8	23.3
% FRPL of HS	21.8	25.0	31.4	31.2	23.7	26.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.3	1.4	0.8	4.5	3.6
SAT Math score	715.1	708.0	584.8	577.5	690.3	683.1
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	709.3	599.6	589.9	692.5	686.5
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	589.8	421.6	424.2	551.9	558.2
	[470.0, 694.0]	[484.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[295.0, 584.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 48: Class of 2024 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	65.5	38.2	38.5	61.2	60.9
African American	6.8	6.0	31.0	25.2	11.0	9.3
Hispanic	10.3	14.5	20.4	26.0	12.0	16.4
Asian American	13.1	9.9	6.3	6.6	11.9	9.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	3.1	3.5	3.1	2.9	3.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.6	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	22.1	38.7	81.7	17.6	32.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.0	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.8
First Generation College	2.3	6.1	13.6	19.8	4.2	8.4
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.7	22.9	20.8	23.3	21.5
% FRPL of HS	22.9	25.9	30.7	32.2	24.2	26.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.3	1.6	1.5	5.3	4.6
SAT Math score	711.0	704.9	574.6	573.1	687.6	682.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	707.1	588.9	582.8	690.6	685.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	591.8	420.5	429.1	556.6	563.8
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[296.0, 581.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 49: Class of 2025 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	64.0	34.2	43.8	57.9	60.2
African American	5.8	4.6	31.8	23.4	10.7	8.1
Hispanic	11.4	14.9	21.4	21.6	13.3	16.1
Asian American	16.5	13.2	8.5	7.9	15.0	12.2
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	2.2	3.5	2.5	2.1	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.7	0.8	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	24.8	34.8	80.5	18.4	35.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.8	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.6
First Generation College	2.7	5.7	6.7	10.2	3.4	6.5
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.9	20.4	18.5	22.7	22.9
% FRPL of HS	22.2	23.7	26.1	26.6	22.9	24.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.1	0.9	0.6	5.7	5.1
SAT Math score	684.1	677.8	566.9	580.6	662.0	659.5
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	667.7	576.7	580.4	656.0	651.2
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	629.9	486.4	482.7	605.0	602.1
	[603.0, 714.0]	[598.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 638.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 50: Class of 2026 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	62.8	28.3	35.1	56.6	58.0
African American	7.0	6.1	36.6	30.1	12.2	10.2
Hispanic	10.5	14.1	19.1	22.1	12.0	15.5
Asian American	15.6	12.7	11.3	8.3	14.9	11.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.6	4.0	3.7	2.7	2.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.7	0.7	0.7	1.7	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	27.1	40.3	81.3	19.5	36.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.5	9.3	9.0	9.9	9.4
First Generation College	3.2	8.1	15.7	21.7	5.4	10.5
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.1	21.3	20.2	21.7	21.8
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.1	25.2	26.1	23.1	24.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.3	0.4	0.3	4.0	3.6
SAT Math score	686.1	676.8	564.5	567.7	665.0	657.9
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	670.7	569.9	568.5	660.1	653.0
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	627.4	444.9	444.9	604.0	595.8
	[618.0, 714.0]	[595.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[318.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

40

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

11   Combined Simulation 10 by year

Table 51: Class of 2023 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	60.4	40.3	33.5	59.5	55.2
African American	6.8	6.6	29.9	24.2	11.2	10.0
Hispanic	10.8	18.4	19.1	29.7	12.3	20.6
Asian American	14.9	10.2	5.1	5.0	13.0	9.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	3.1	4.4	6.1	2.6	3.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	27.2	45.3	87.1	21.3	38.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.1	8.1	8.0	9.5	8.9
First Generation College	2.6	7.4	11.6	16.6	4.3	9.2
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.3	20.4	19.3	24.8	23.3
% FRPL of HS	21.8	25.4	31.4	31.2	23.7	26.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.1	1.4	0.7	4.5	3.5
SAT Math score	715.1	707.4	584.8	574.0	690.3	682.0
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	708.6	599.6	586.7	692.5	685.3
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	592.0	421.6	419.5	551.9	559.1
	[470.0, 694.0]	[489.0, 695.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[288.0, 572.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 52: Class of 2024 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	61.5	38.2	33.8	61.2	56.7
African American	6.8	6.8	31.0	27.3	11.0	10.3
Hispanic	10.3	17.6	20.4	29.2	12.0	19.6
Asian American	13.1	9.3	6.3	5.8	11.9	8.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	3.8	3.5	3.4	2.9	3.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.0	0.5	0.5	1.0	0.9
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	23.5	38.7	81.7	17.6	33.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.9	8.3	7.9	9.4	8.8
First Generation College	2.3	6.8	13.6	21.0	4.2	9.2
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.4	22.9	21.0	23.3	21.3
% FRPL of HS	22.9	26.4	30.7	32.5	24.2	27.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.1	1.6	1.4	5.3	4.5
SAT Math score	711.0	704.4	574.6	568.9	687.6	681.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	706.9	588.9	578.3	690.6	684.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	593.6	420.5	429.0	556.6	565.4
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[292.0, 581.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 53: Class of 2025 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	60.6	34.2	38.5	57.9	56.4
African American	5.8	5.2	31.8	25.5	10.7	9.0
Hispanic	11.4	18.1	21.4	25.8	13.3	19.5
Asian American	16.5	12.5	8.5	6.6	15.0	11.4
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	2.7	3.5	2.9	2.1	2.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.7	0.7	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	26.5	34.8	80.5	18.4	36.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.7	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.6
First Generation College	2.7	6.3	6.7	11.0	3.4	7.2
Attended Private HS	23.3	24.0	20.4	19.1	22.7	23.1
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.0	26.1	26.4	22.9	24.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.1	0.9	0.5	5.7	5.0
SAT Math score	684.1	676.1	566.9	575.8	662.0	657.2
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	665.8	576.7	577.0	656.0	649.1
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	630.0	486.4	479.6	605.0	601.6
	[603.0, 714.0]	[599.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 636.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

42

Table 54: Class of 2026 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	59.1	28.3	29.6	56.6	54.0
African American	7.0	7.2	36.6	33.2	12.2	11.7
Hispanic	10.5	17.1	19.1	25.2	12.0	18.5
Asian American	15.6	11.9	11.3	7.3	14.9	11.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	3.1	4.0	4.2	2.7	3.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.6	0.7	0.5	1.7	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	28.8	40.3	81.3	19.5	37.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.4	9.3	9.1	9.9	9.4
First Generation College	3.2	8.9	15.7	22.5	5.4	11.2
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.2	21.3	20.4	21.7	21.9
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.4	25.2	26.0	23.1	24.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.3	0.4	0.2	4.0	3.6
SAT Math score	686.1	675.2	564.5	563.4	665.0	655.8
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	669.4	569.9	563.9	660.1	651.1
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	627.0	444.9	437.4	604.0	594.2
	[618.0, 714.0]	[595.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[314.0, 594.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

43

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

12   Combined Simulation 11 by year

Table 55: Class of 2023 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	54.1	40.3	27.6	59.5	49.0
African American	6.8	7.8	29.9	26.1	11.2	11.3
Hispanic	10.8	23.9	19.1	34.5	12.3	25.9
Asian American	14.9	9.1	5.1	3.9	13.0	8.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	4.0	4.4	6.7	2.6	4.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	29.6	45.3	87.1	21.3	40.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.0	8.1	8.1	9.5	8.8
First Generation College	2.6	8.3	11.6	18.1	4.3	10.2
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.1	20.4	20.1	24.8	23.3
% FRPL of HS	21.8	26.1	31.4	30.8	23.7	27.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.9	1.4	0.5	4.5	3.2
SAT Math score	715.1	706.6	584.8	569.5	690.3	680.5
	[660.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	707.5	599.6	582.6	692.5	683.6
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	595.6	421.6	411.1	551.9	560.4
	[470.0, 694.0]	[503.0, 697.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[287.0, 543.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

44

Table 56: Class of 2024 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	55.0	38.2	27.7	61.2	50.3
African American	6.8	8.2	31.0	30.3	11.0	12.0
Hispanic	10.3	22.8	20.4	33.1	12.0	24.6
Asian American	13.1	8.3	6.3	4.7	11.9	7.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	4.9	3.5	3.8	2.9	4.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	0.9	0.5	0.4	1.0	0.8
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	25.8	38.7	81.7	17.6	35.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.9	8.3	7.9	9.4	8.7
First Generation College	2.3	8.0	13.6	22.7	4.2	10.5
Attended Private HS	23.4	20.9	22.9	21.3	23.3	20.9
% FRPL of HS	22.9	27.5	30.7	32.7	24.2	28.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.9	1.6	1.2	5.3	4.3
SAT Math score	711.0	703.5	574.6	563.1	687.6	679.4
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 600.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	706.5	588.9	572.2	690.6	683.5
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	596.7	420.5	428.7	556.6	567.9
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[290.0, 597.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 57: Class of 2025 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	55.0	34.2	31.2	57.9	50.5
African American	5.8	6.1	31.8	28.2	10.7	10.2
Hispanic	11.4	23.3	21.4	31.7	13.3	24.9
Asian American	16.5	11.3	8.5	5.0	15.0	10.1
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	3.4	3.5	3.3	2.1	3.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.0	0.7	0.6	1.0	0.9
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	29.5	34.8	80.5	18.4	39.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.6	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.5
First Generation College	2.7	7.4	6.7	11.7	3.4	8.2
Attended Private HS	23.3	24.0	20.4	20.0	22.7	23.3
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.6	26.1	26.0	22.9	24.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.0	0.9	0.3	5.7	4.9
SAT Math score	684.1	673.5	566.9	569.5	662.0	653.8
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	662.9	576.7	572.6	656.0	645.8
	[640.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	630.1	486.4	476.5	605.0	601.1
	[603.0, 714.0]	[599.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 633.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 58: Class of 2026 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	53.1	28.3	22.6	56.6	47.8
African American	7.0	9.1	36.6	37.7	12.2	14.1
Hispanic	10.5	22.1	19.1	28.7	12.0	23.2
Asian American	15.6	10.6	11.3	5.8	14.9	9.8
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	3.7	4.0	4.8	2.7	3.9
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.4	0.7	0.3	1.7	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	31.7	40.3	81.3	19.5	40.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.3	9.3	9.1	9.9	9.3
First Generation College	3.2	10.2	15.7	23.3	5.4	12.4
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.3	21.3	20.7	21.7	22.0
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.0	25.2	25.8	23.1	25.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.3	0.4	0.1	4.0	3.6
SAT Math score	686.1	672.5	564.5	557.8	665.0	652.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 590.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	667.2	569.9	557.8	660.1	648.3
	[630.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[510.0, 610.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	626.7	444.9	425.1	604.0	591.8
	[618.0, 714.0]	[595.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[303.0, 559.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

13   Combined Simulation 12 by year

Table 59: Class of 2023 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	67.3	40.3	44.4	59.5	62.9
African American	6.8	5.1	29.9	20.1	11.2	7.9
Hispanic	10.8	11.8	19.1	21.5	12.3	13.6
Asian American	14.9	12.3	5.1	7.0	13.0	11.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.0	4.4	5.1	2.6	2.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.8	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	32.2	45.3	87.2	21.3	42.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.1	8.1	7.9	9.5	8.8
First Generation College	2.6	7.4	11.6	14.9	4.3	8.8
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.1	20.4	19.8	24.8	23.3
% FRPL of HS	21.8	25.4	31.4	30.3	23.7	26.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.0	1.4	0.8	4.5	3.4
SAT Math score	715.1	707.9	584.8	580.0	690.3	683.5
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	709.1	599.6	591.5	692.5	686.7
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	589.8	421.6	421.4	551.9	557.7
	[470.0, 694.0]	[489.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[290.0, 567.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 60: Class of 2024 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	68.6	38.2	44.2	61.2	64.4
African American	6.8	5.1	31.0	22.9	11.0	8.2
Hispanic	10.3	11.7	20.4	21.4	12.0	13.4
Asian American	13.1	11.0	6.3	8.2	11.9	10.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.6	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	27.6	38.7	81.7	17.6	36.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.9	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.8
First Generation College	2.3	6.5	13.6	20.0	4.2	8.9
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.5	22.9	21.2	23.3	21.5
% FRPL of HS	22.9	26.0	30.7	31.4	24.2	27.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.1	1.6	1.6	5.3	4.5
SAT Math score	711.0	703.9	574.6	572.0	687.6	681.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	706.2	588.9	582.3	690.6	685.0
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	590.9	420.5	423.8	556.6	562.3
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[292.0, 567.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 61: Class of 2025 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	66.5	34.2	48.1	57.9	63.0
African American	5.8	4.0	31.8	21.2	10.7	7.2
Hispanic	11.4	12.0	21.4	18.9	13.3	13.3
Asian American	16.5	14.7	8.5	8.8	15.0	13.5
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.7	3.5	2.1	2.1	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	31.1	34.8	80.5	18.4	40.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.7	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.6
First Generation College	2.7	5.9	6.7	9.3	3.4	6.6
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.2	20.4	18.8	22.7	22.3
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.0	26.1	26.3	22.9	24.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.9	0.9	0.6	5.7	4.9
SAT Math score	684.1	678.7	566.9	583.4	662.0	660.7
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	667.7	576.7	582.3	656.0	651.6
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	629.0	486.4	480.2	605.0	600.9
	[603.0, 714.0]	[598.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[348.0, 636.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 62: Class of 2026 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	65.6	28.3	39.4	56.6	61.1
African American	7.0	5.2	36.6	27.9	12.2	9.1
Hispanic	10.5	11.2	19.1	18.4	12.0	12.4
Asian American	15.6	14.4	11.3	10.3	14.9	13.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	1.8	4.0	3.3	2.7	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	0.7	1.7	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	34.0	40.3	81.3	19.5	42.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.4	9.3	9.1	9.9	9.4
First Generation College	3.2	8.8	15.7	21.5	5.4	11.0
Attended Private HS	21.8	21.6	21.3	20.4	21.7	21.4
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.2	25.2	25.6	23.1	24.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.9	0.4	0.2	4.0	3.3
SAT Math score	686.1	676.4	564.5	571.2	665.0	658.1
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	669.9	569.9	571.4	660.1	652.8
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	626.5	444.9	443.5	604.0	594.8
	[618.0, 714.0]	[594.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[315.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

14   Combined Simulation 13 by year

Table 63: Class of 2023 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	66.0	40.3	44.3	59.5	61.9
African American	6.8	5.3	29.9	19.9	11.2	8.0
Hispanic	10.8	12.3	19.1	21.8	12.3	14.1
Asian American	14.9	12.8	5.1	6.9	13.0	11.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.2	4.4	5.1	2.6	2.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.4	1.2	2.1	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	38.8	45.3	87.1	21.3	48.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.9	8.1	8.0	9.5	8.7
First Generation College	2.6	8.4	11.6	15.3	4.3	9.7
Attended Private HS	25.8	23.8	20.4	20.8	24.8	23.2
% FRPL of HS	21.8	26.1	31.4	29.7	23.7	26.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.7	1.4	0.7	4.5	3.1
SAT Math score	715.1	707.5	584.8	578.9	690.3	683.0
	[660.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	708.4	599.6	589.6	692.5	685.7
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	592.2	421.6	414.2	551.9	558.3
	[470.0, 694.0]	[494.0, 695.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[288.0, 543.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 64: Class of 2024 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	67.3	38.2	43.5	61.2	63.2
African American	6.8	5.4	31.0	23.5	11.0	8.5
Hispanic	10.3	12.6	20.4	21.3	12.0	14.1
Asian American	13.1	11.4	6.3	8.5	11.9	10.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.5	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	33.4	38.7	81.7	17.6	41.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.8	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.7
First Generation College	2.3	7.6	13.6	21.1	4.2	9.9
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.1	22.9	21.8	23.3	21.2
% FRPL of HS	22.9	26.7	30.7	31.2	24.2	27.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.9	1.6	1.7	5.3	4.3
SAT Math score	711.0	702.6	574.6	567.5	687.6	679.4
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	705.4	588.9	577.9	690.6	683.5
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	592.2	420.5	418.5	556.6	562.4
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[290.0, 565.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 65: Class of 2025 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	65.2	34.2	46.4	57.9	61.7
African American	5.8	4.1	31.8	21.5	10.7	7.4
Hispanic	11.4	12.7	21.4	20.3	13.3	14.2
Asian American	16.5	15.1	8.5	8.6	15.0	13.9
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.6	3.5	2.1	2.1	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	38.0	34.8	80.5	18.4	46.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.6	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.5
First Generation College	2.7	6.8	6.7	9.1	3.4	7.2
Attended Private HS	23.3	22.5	20.4	19.5	22.7	22.0
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.5	26.1	25.9	22.9	24.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.6	0.9	0.4	5.7	4.6
SAT Math score	684.1	677.9	566.9	580.9	662.0	659.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	666.2	576.7	580.3	656.0	650.0
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	628.5	486.4	474.5	605.0	599.4
	[603.0, 714.0]	[598.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[348.0, 632.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 66: Class of 2026 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	64.2	28.3	37.2	56.6	59.6
African American	7.0	5.6	36.6	29.2	12.2	9.7
Hispanic	10.5	11.6	19.1	18.7	12.0	12.9
Asian American	15.6	15.1	11.3	10.9	14.9	14.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	1.7	4.0	3.4	2.7	2.0
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.7	0.7	0.6	1.7	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	41.2	40.3	81.3	19.5	48.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.3	9.3	9.2	9.9	9.3
First Generation College	3.2	10.1	15.7	22.4	5.4	12.2
Attended Private HS	21.8	21.2	21.3	20.7	21.7	21.1
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.6	25.2	25.3	23.1	24.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.6	0.4	0.2	4.0	3.0
SAT Math score	686.1	674.8	564.5	569.8	665.0	656.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	668.3	569.9	569.4	660.1	651.2
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	626.0	444.9	434.5	604.0	592.8
	[618.0, 714.0]	[594.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[310.0, 581.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

15   Combined Simulation 14 by year

Table 67: Class of 2023 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	64.2	40.3	44.1	59.5	60.4
African American	6.8	5.5	29.9	19.5	11.2	8.1
Hispanic	10.8	13.0	19.1	22.2	12.3	14.8
Asian American	14.9	13.6	5.1	6.6	13.0	12.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.4	4.4	5.0	2.6	2.9
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.3	1.2	2.5	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	48.6	45.3	87.1	21.3	56.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.7	8.1	8.1	9.5	8.6
First Generation College	2.6	9.8	11.6	15.8	4.3	10.9
Attended Private HS	25.8	23.3	20.4	22.1	24.8	23.1
% FRPL of HS	21.8	27.0	31.4	28.7	23.7	27.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.2	1.4	0.6	4.5	2.7
SAT Math score	715.1	707.5	584.8	577.8	690.3	682.8
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	707.8	599.6	587.1	692.5	684.8
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	596.6	421.6	404.0	551.9	559.8
	[470.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[287.0, 511.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 68: Class of 2024 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	65.1	38.2	42.3	61.2	61.2
African American	6.8	5.7	31.0	24.6	11.0	8.9
Hispanic	10.3	13.9	20.4	21.1	12.0	15.1
Asian American	13.1	11.9	6.3	8.9	11.9	11.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.4	3.5	2.4	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.0	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	42.4	38.7	81.7	17.6	49.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.7	8.3	8.1	9.4	8.6
First Generation College	2.3	9.3	13.6	22.2	4.2	11.5
Attended Private HS	23.4	20.4	22.9	22.4	23.3	20.8
% FRPL of HS	22.9	27.9	30.7	30.6	24.2	28.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.6	1.6	1.7	5.3	4.1
SAT Math score	711.0	700.7	574.6	561.7	687.6	676.9
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 600.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	704.3	588.9	572.3	690.6	681.6
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	594.4	420.5	411.4	556.6	563.0
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[288.0, 546.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 69: Class of 2025 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	63.1	34.2	44.7	57.9	59.7
African American	5.8	4.2	31.8	21.3	10.7	7.4
Hispanic	11.4	13.9	21.4	22.0	13.3	15.4
Asian American	16.5	16.0	8.5	8.9	15.0	14.7
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.7	3.5	2.2	2.1	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	48.6	34.8	80.5	18.4	54.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.4	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.4
First Generation College	2.7	8.2	6.7	8.5	3.4	8.2
Attended Private HS	23.3	21.5	20.4	20.3	22.7	21.2
% FRPL of HS	22.2	25.5	26.1	25.5	22.9	25.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.0	0.9	0.2	5.7	4.1
SAT Math score	684.1	677.0	566.9	578.4	662.0	658.4
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	664.1	576.7	579.0	656.0	648.1
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	627.9	486.4	466.8	605.0	597.5
	[603.0, 714.0]	[599.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[342.0, 624.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 70: Class of 2026 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	62.1	28.3	34.8	56.6	57.4
African American	7.0	6.2	36.6	31.0	12.2	10.5
Hispanic	10.5	12.2	19.1	18.9	12.0	13.4
Asian American	15.6	16.4	11.3	11.6	14.9	15.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	1.4	4.0	3.3	2.7	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.6	0.7	0.4	1.7	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	51.7	40.3	81.3	19.5	56.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.2	9.3	9.2	9.9	9.2
First Generation College	3.2	11.9	15.7	23.8	5.4	14.0
Attended Private HS	21.8	20.5	21.3	21.1	21.7	20.6
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.2	25.2	25.0	23.1	25.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.2	0.4	0.1	4.0	2.6
SAT Math score	686.1	673.2	564.5	567.7	665.0	654.9
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	666.5	569.9	566.4	660.1	649.1
	[630.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	626.4	444.9	421.5	604.0	590.9
	[618.0, 714.0]	[595.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[301.0, 555.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Simulations with 1.0 x Black Coefficient

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Table of Contents

List of Tables

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

1   Simulations for all years together

Table 1: Pooled Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits Status Quo	USNA Non-Prep Admits Simulated	USNA Admits from Prep Status Quo	USNA Admits from Prep Simulated	Overall Admits Status Quo	Overall Admits Simulated
White	63.2	70.9	35.1	52.1	58.0	67.4
African American	6.8	3.9	32.4	20.5	11.5	6.9
Hispanic	11.0	9.2	20.0	16.3	12.6	10.5
Asian American	15.4	12.5	7.9	6.7	14.0	11.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	1.9	3.8	3.0	2.6	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.6	0.8	1.3	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	12.8	39.7	36.8	18.8	17.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	10.0	8.7	8.8	9.8	9.8
First Generation College	2.9	2.5	11.9	11.0	4.6	4.1
Attended Private HS	23.7	24.0	21.2	21.7	23.3	23.6
% FRPL of HS	22.4	22.1	28.3	27.6	23.5	23.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.9	1.1	1.2	4.9	5.0
SAT Math score	695.6	697.3	572.5	582.3	673.1	676.2
	[640.0, 760.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	692.5	583.4	592.7	671.0	674.2
	[640.0, 740.0]	[650.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	619.0	443.7	452.3	585.0	588.5
	[574.0, 707.0]	[583.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[320.0, 624.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

Table 2: Pooled Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 1.00x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	67.9	35.1	45.6	58.0	63.8
African American	6.8	4.7	32.4	21.9	11.5	7.8
Hispanic	11.0	10.7	20.0	20.3	12.6	12.4
Asian American	15.4	13.2	7.9	7.9	14.0	12.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.1	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	23.7	39.7	64.6	18.8	31.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.8	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.6
First Generation College	2.9	6.5	11.9	24.7	4.6	9.9
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.3	21.2	20.1	23.3	22.7
% FRPL of HS	22.4	23.0	28.3	29.7	23.5	24.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.3	1.1	0.6	4.9	4.4
SAT Math score	695.6	691.0	572.5	575.2	673.1	669.8
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	686.3	583.4	581.7	671.0	667.1
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	612.2	443.7	447.0	585.0	582.0
	[574.0, 707.0]	[559.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[320.0, 616.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 1 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to 1 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 3: Pooled Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	67.4	35.1	45.6	58.0	63.4
African American	6.8	4.9	32.4	21.9	11.5	8.0
Hispanic	11.0	10.8	20.0	20.3	12.6	12.6
Asian American	15.4	13.4	7.9	8.0	14.0	12.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.0	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	24.3	39.7	65.1	18.8	31.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.5	8.7	8.3	9.8	9.3
First Generation College	2.9	6.7	11.9	24.6	4.6	10.0
Attended Private HS	23.7	17.2	21.2	16.1	23.3	17.0
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.8	28.3	31.5	23.5	26.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.0	1.1	0.6	4.9	4.2
SAT Math score	695.6	689.5	572.5	574.9	673.1	668.5
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	684.4	583.4	581.4	671.0	665.6
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	612.7	443.7	449.1	585.0	582.8
	[574.0, 707.0]	[559.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[322.0, 622.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 2 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .5 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .5 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 4: Pooled Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	67.4	35.1	45.6	58.0	63.4
African American	6.8	4.9	32.4	21.9	11.5	8.0
Hispanic	11.0	10.9	20.0	20.3	12.6	12.6
Asian American	15.4	13.4	7.9	8.0	14.0	12.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.0	2.6	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	24.3	39.7	65.1	18.8	31.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.5	8.7	8.3	9.8	9.3
First Generation College	2.9	6.7	11.9	24.5	4.6	10.0
Attended Private HS	23.7	17.2	21.2	16.1	23.3	17.0
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.8	28.3	31.5	23.5	26.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.4	1.1	0.8	4.9	3.8
SAT Math score	695.6	689.4	572.5	574.9	673.1	668.4
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	684.3	583.4	581.4	671.0	665.5
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	612.7	443.7	449.0	585.0	582.7
	[574.0, 707.0]	[559.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[322.0, 622.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 3 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

Table 5: Pooled Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	66.4	35.1	44.9	58.0	62.5
African American	6.8	4.9	32.4	21.4	11.5	7.9
Hispanic	11.0	11.3	20.0	21.0	12.6	13.1
Asian American	15.4	13.8	7.9	8.4	14.0	12.8
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.1	3.8	3.2	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.6	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	25.7	39.7	67.6	18.8	33.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.2	8.7	8.2	9.8	9.0
First Generation College	2.9	7.1	11.9	25.3	4.6	10.4
Attended Private HS	23.7	15.8	21.2	14.9	23.3	15.6
% FRPL of HS	22.4	26.6	28.3	32.3	23.5	27.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	3.1	6.5	0.7	12.2	2.7
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.5	1.1	0.9	4.9	3.9
SAT Math score	695.6	693.4	572.5	576.3	673.1	672.0
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	689.1	583.4	583.8	671.0	669.8
	[640.0, 740.0]	[650.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	623.4	443.7	457.9	585.0	593.1
	[574.0, 707.0]	[595.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[326.0, 626.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 4 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

Table 6: Pooled Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	67.2	35.1	45.5	58.0	63.2
African American	6.8	5.0	32.4	22.0	11.5	8.1
Hispanic	11.0	11.4	20.0	20.5	12.6	13.0
Asian American	15.4	13.0	7.9	7.8	14.0	12.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.1	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	25.6	39.7	64.5	18.8	32.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.3	8.7	8.3	9.8	9.1
First Generation College	2.9	7.2	11.9	24.7	4.6	10.4
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.5	21.2	21.2	23.3	23.1
% FRPL of HS	22.4	24.6	28.3	29.6	23.5	25.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.0	1.1	0.6	4.9	4.2
SAT Math score	695.6	686.5	572.5	573.8	673.1	665.9
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	682.9	583.4	580.7	671.0	664.2
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	611.1	443.7	447.3	585.0	581.1
	[574.0, 707.0]	[555.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[320.0, 618.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 3 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.5 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 7: Pooled Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	67.2	35.1	45.8	58.0	63.3
African American	6.8	5.0	32.4	22.3	11.5	8.2
Hispanic	11.0	11.4	20.0	19.1	12.6	12.8
Asian American	15.4	13.0	7.9	8.6	14.0	12.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.1	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.0	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	25.6	39.7	82.6	18.8	36.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.3	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.2
First Generation College	2.9	7.2	11.9	15.5	4.6	8.7
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.5	21.2	19.2	23.3	22.7
% FRPL of HS	22.4	24.6	28.3	28.8	23.5	25.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.0	1.1	0.9	4.9	4.2
SAT Math score	695.6	686.5	572.5	580.5	673.1	667.1
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	682.9	583.4	585.7	671.0	665.1
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	611.1	443.7	450.2	585.0	581.6
	[574.0, 707.0]	[555.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[323.0, 620.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 6 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

Table 8: Pooled Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	66.9	35.1	51.8	58.0	61.3
African American	6.8	4.9	32.4	16.1	11.5	9.0
Hispanic	11.0	11.5	20.0	18.3	12.6	14.0
Asian American	15.4	13.1	7.9	9.9	14.0	12.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	2.8	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.0	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	28.4	39.7	74.7	18.8	45.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.2	8.7	8.5	9.8	8.9
First Generation College	2.9	8.1	11.9	12.9	4.6	9.9
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.5	21.2	18.4	23.3	21.7
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.1	28.3	28.6	23.5	26.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.4	6.5	3.3	12.2	9.7
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.1	1.1	1.4	4.9	3.8
SAT Math score	695.6	689.3	572.5	600.6	673.1	656.9
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[540.0, 660.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	685.1	583.4	607.0	671.0	656.5
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[550.0, 670.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	617.7	443.7	465.2	585.0	561.9
	[574.0, 707.0]	[578.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[332.0, 631.0]		
N	5,642	4,378	1,264	2,528	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

Table 9: Pooled Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	62.4	35.1	38.9	58.0	58.1
African American	6.8	6.2	32.4	25.4	11.5	9.7
Hispanic	11.0	15.3	20.0	23.9	12.6	16.9
Asian American	15.4	12.1	7.9	7.2	14.0	11.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.7	3.8	3.7	2.6	2.9
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.4	0.8	0.9	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	27.9	39.7	82.6	18.8	37.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.3	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.1
First Generation College	2.9	8.2	11.9	16.9	4.6	9.8
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.4	21.2	19.6	23.3	22.7
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.1	28.3	28.9	23.5	25.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.9	1.1	0.8	4.9	4.1
SAT Math score	695.6	684.6	572.5	574.6	673.1	664.5
	[640.0, 760.0]	[630.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	681.1	583.4	580.1	671.0	662.6
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	611.5	443.7	445.5	585.0	581.1
	[574.0, 707.0]	[557.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[318.0, 613.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 10: Pooled Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	58.4	35.1	33.8	58.0	53.9
African American	6.8	7.1	32.4	27.7	11.5	10.9
Hispanic	11.0	18.6	20.0	27.4	12.6	20.2
Asian American	15.4	11.3	7.9	6.2	14.0	10.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	3.2	3.8	4.1	2.6	3.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.3	0.8	0.8	1.3	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	29.9	39.7	82.6	18.8	39.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.2	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.1
First Generation College	2.9	9.1	11.9	17.8	4.6	10.7
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.3	21.2	20.0	23.3	22.7
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.6	28.3	28.9	23.5	26.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.7	1.1	0.7	4.9	4.0
SAT Math score	695.6	683.0	572.5	570.4	673.1	662.4
	[640.0, 760.0]	[630.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	679.6	583.4	576.2	671.0	660.7
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	611.8	443.7	441.6	585.0	580.7
	[574.0, 707.0]	[559.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[314.0, 610.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 11: Pooled Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	52.0	35.1	27.2	58.0	47.5
African American	6.8	8.6	32.4	30.7	11.5	12.7
Hispanic	11.0	24.1	20.0	31.9	12.6	25.5
Asian American	15.4	10.1	7.9	4.9	14.0	9.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	4.1	3.8	4.6	2.6	4.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.1	0.8	0.6	1.3	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	33.3	39.7	82.6	18.8	42.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.1	8.7	8.6	9.8	9.0
First Generation College	2.9	10.8	11.9	19.0	4.6	12.3
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.0	21.2	20.5	23.3	22.6
% FRPL of HS	22.4	26.4	28.3	28.7	23.5	26.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.5	1.1	0.5	4.9	3.8
SAT Math score	695.6	680.3	572.5	564.8	673.1	659.2
	[640.0, 760.0]	[620.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	677.1	583.4	571.0	671.0	657.7
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	612.5	443.7	435.5	585.0	580.1
	[574.0, 707.0]	[562.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[308.0, 599.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

11

Table 12: Pooled Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	65.3	35.1	44.0	58.0	61.4
African American	6.8	5.4	32.4	23.1	11.5	8.6
Hispanic	11.0	12.3	20.0	20.0	12.6	13.7
Asian American	15.4	13.6	7.9	8.6	14.0	12.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.2	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.4	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	34.7	39.7	82.6	18.8	43.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.2	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.1
First Generation College	2.9	8.8	11.9	16.5	4.6	10.2
Attended Private HS	23.7	22.9	21.2	20.1	23.3	22.4
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.4	28.3	28.3	23.5	25.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.6	1.1	0.8	4.9	3.9
SAT Math score	695.6	684.2	572.5	576.6	673.1	664.5
	[640.0, 760.0]	[630.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	680.4	583.4	581.7	671.0	662.4
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	610.2	443.7	442.5	585.0	579.5
	[574.0, 707.0]	[551.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[314.0, 608.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 13: Pooled Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	63.7	35.1	42.8	58.0	59.8
African American	6.8	5.7	32.4	23.6	11.5	9.0
Hispanic	11.0	13.1	20.0	20.5	12.6	14.4
Asian American	15.4	14.2	7.9	8.8	14.0	13.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.1	3.8	3.3	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.3	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	42.1	39.7	82.6	18.8	49.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.1	8.7	8.6	9.8	9.0
First Generation College	2.9	10.3	11.9	17.0	4.6	11.5
Attended Private HS	23.7	22.3	21.2	20.7	23.3	22.0
% FRPL of HS	22.4	26.1	28.3	28.0	23.5	26.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.2	1.1	0.7	4.9	3.6
SAT Math score	695.6	682.7	572.5	574.2	673.1	662.8
	[640.0, 760.0]	[630.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	678.7	583.4	579.1	671.0	660.5
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	610.0	443.7	435.7	585.0	578.1
	[574.0, 707.0]	[551.0, 705.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[308.0, 598.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

12

Table 14: Pooled Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	61.3	35.1	41.4	58.0	57.7
African American	6.8	6.0	32.4	24.2	11.5	9.4
Hispanic	11.0	14.2	20.0	21.0	12.6	15.4
Asian American	15.4	15.2	7.9	9.1	14.0	14.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.1	3.8	3.2	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.2	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	53.0	39.7	82.6	18.8	58.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	8.9	8.7	8.7	9.8	8.9
First Generation College	2.9	12.6	11.9	17.7	4.6	13.5
Attended Private HS	23.7	21.4	21.2	21.5	23.3	21.4
% FRPL of HS	22.4	27.1	28.3	27.4	23.5	27.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	3.6	1.1	0.6	4.9	3.1
SAT Math score	695.6	681.2	572.5	571.3	673.1	661.1
	[640.0, 760.0]	[630.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	676.7	583.4	576.0	671.0	658.3
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	610.9	443.7	426.2	585.0	577.1
	[574.0, 707.0]	[554.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[298.0, 581.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

2   Combined Simulation 1 by year

Table 15: Class of 2023 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	71.5	40.3	56.3	59.5	68.6
African American	6.8	4.3	29.9	17.1	11.2	6.7
Hispanic	10.8	9.3	19.1	16.4	12.3	10.7
Asian American	14.9	11.5	5.1	4.6	13.0	10.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.7	4.4	3.9	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	14.4	45.3	41.1	21.3	19.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.8	8.1	8.1	9.5	9.5
First Generation College	2.6	2.4	11.6	11.1	4.3	4.0
Attended Private HS	25.8	26.2	20.4	21.1	24.8	25.2
% FRPL of HS	21.8	21.5	31.4	30.4	23.7	23.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	5.2	1.4	1.3	4.5	4.5
SAT Math score	715.1	715.6	584.8	593.6	690.3	692.4
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	716.1	599.6	607.3	692.5	695.4
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 790.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[560.0, 660.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	584.2	421.6	428.7	551.9	554.5
	[470.0, 694.0]	[470.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[296.0, 602.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

Table 16: Class of 2024 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	72.8	38.2	52.2	61.2	69.3
African American	6.8	4.4	31.0	20.1	11.0	7.1
Hispanic	10.3	9.0	20.4	18.1	12.0	10.6
Asian American	13.1	10.3	6.3	5.8	11.9	9.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.2	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.3	0.5	0.9	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	12.1	38.7	36.6	17.6	16.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.5	8.3	8.4	9.4	9.3
First Generation College	2.3	1.9	13.6	13.2	4.2	3.9
Attended Private HS	23.4	23.8	22.9	23.4	23.3	23.7
% FRPL of HS	22.9	22.6	30.7	29.9	24.2	23.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	6.0	1.6	2.0	5.3	5.3
SAT Math score	711.0	711.7	574.6	581.4	687.6	689.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	712.8	588.9	596.1	690.6	692.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[670.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	587.3	420.5	426.2	556.6	559.6
	[476.0, 694.0]	[484.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[297.0, 581.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

Table 17: Class of 2025 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	71.1	34.2	53.3	57.9	67.7
African American	5.8	3.1	31.8	19.6	10.7	6.2
Hispanic	11.4	9.3	21.4	16.6	13.3	10.7
Asian American	16.5	13.8	8.5	6.8	15.0	12.5
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.5	3.5	2.5	2.1	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.2	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	13.6	34.8	32.8	18.4	17.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	10.4	9.2	9.3	10.1	10.2
First Generation College	2.7	2.3	6.7	5.6	3.4	2.9
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.6	20.4	20.9	22.7	23.1
% FRPL of HS	22.2	21.9	26.1	25.3	22.9	22.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	7.0	0.9	1.0	5.7	5.8
SAT Math score	684.1	687.3	566.9	581.0	662.0	667.3
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	677.4	576.7	589.7	656.0	660.8
	[640.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	635.3	486.4	497.3	605.0	609.2
	[603.0, 714.0]	[612.0, 714.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[351.0, 663.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

Table 18: Class of 2026 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	70.2	28.3	47.1	56.6	66.2
African American	7.0	3.5	36.6	25.0	12.2	7.2
Hispanic	10.5	8.9	19.1	14.4	12.0	9.8
Asian American	15.6	13.2	11.3	9.2	14.9	12.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.1	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	2.0	0.7	1.4	1.7	1.9
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	13.8	40.3	37.0	19.5	17.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	10.0	9.3	9.3	9.9	9.9
First Generation College	3.2	2.8	15.7	13.9	5.4	4.7
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.0	21.3	21.3	21.7	21.9
% FRPL of HS	22.7	22.4	25.2	25.1	23.1	22.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.8	0.4	0.6	4.0	4.1
SAT Math score	686.1	688.4	564.5	574.2	665.0	668.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	681.0	569.9	579.2	660.1	663.3
	[630.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	639.4	444.9	455.4	604.0	607.5
	[618.0, 714.0]	[621.0, 714.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[320.0, 616.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

3   Combined Simulation 2 by year

Table 19: Class of 2023 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 1.00x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	68.9	40.3	46.9	59.5	64.7
African American	6.8	5.0	29.9	18.6	11.2	7.6
Hispanic	10.8	10.5	19.1	22.0	12.3	12.7
Asian American	14.9	12.1	5.1	6.3	13.0	11.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.9	4.4	4.5	2.6	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	24.8	45.3	68.4	21.3	33.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.6	8.1	7.7	9.5	9.3
First Generation College	2.6	6.6	11.6	26.3	4.3	10.3
Attended Private HS	25.8	25.5	20.4	18.5	24.8	24.1
% FRPL of HS	21.8	22.6	31.4	34.0	23.7	24.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.6	1.4	0.6	4.5	3.8
SAT Math score	715.1	710.3	584.8	581.7	690.3	685.8
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	710.9	599.6	593.6	692.5	688.5
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	581.3	421.6	432.7	551.9	552.9
	[470.0, 694.0]	[468.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[304.0, 618.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 15 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to 1 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 20: Class of 2024 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 1.00x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	70.3	38.2	46.1	61.2	66.1
African American	6.8	4.9	31.0	21.0	11.0	7.6
Hispanic	10.3	10.5	20.4	22.3	12.0	12.6
Asian American	13.1	10.8	6.3	7.0	11.9	10.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	21.4	38.7	61.6	17.6	28.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.3	8.3	8.0	9.4	9.1
First Generation College	2.3	5.7	13.6	28.6	4.2	9.6
Attended Private HS	23.4	23.0	22.9	22.6	23.3	22.9
% FRPL of HS	22.9	23.6	30.7	32.4	24.2	25.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.4	1.6	1.2	5.3	4.7
SAT Math score	711.0	706.3	574.6	574.1	687.6	683.6
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	707.8	588.9	585.7	690.6	686.9
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	584.4	420.5	424.4	556.6	556.9
	[476.0, 694.0]	[479.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[296.0, 567.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 16 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to 1 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 21: Class of 2025 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 1.00x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	68.3	34.2	49.4	57.9	64.7
African American	5.8	3.8	31.8	20.8	10.7	7.0
Hispanic	11.4	10.9	21.4	17.9	13.3	12.2
Asian American	16.5	14.3	8.5	8.6	15.0	13.3
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.5	3.5	2.2	2.1	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.1	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	24.1	34.8	61.2	18.4	31.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	10.2	9.2	9.1	10.1	10.0
First Generation College	2.7	5.3	6.7	14.9	3.4	7.1
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.0	20.4	19.6	22.7	22.4
% FRPL of HS	22.2	22.6	26.1	26.4	22.9	23.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.4	0.9	0.5	5.7	5.3
SAT Math score	684.1	681.1	566.9	579.0	662.0	661.8
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	670.8	576.7	581.0	656.0	653.9
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	628.6	486.4	486.8	605.0	601.8
	[603.0, 714.0]	[595.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 644.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 17 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to 1 times the coefficient on African American.

18

Table 22: Class of 2026 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 1.00x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	67.2	28.3	40.4	56.6	62.5
African American	7.0	4.7	36.6	26.7	12.2	8.5
Hispanic	10.5	10.6	19.1	19.3	12.0	12.1
Asian American	15.6	13.8	11.3	9.6	14.9	13.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	1.1	1.7	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	26.2	40.3	67.1	19.5	33.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.9	9.3	9.0	9.9	9.7
First Generation College	3.2	7.8	15.7	28.8	5.4	11.4
Attended Private HS	21.8	21.5	21.3	19.7	21.7	21.2
% FRPL of HS	22.7	23.0	25.2	26.5	23.1	23.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.2	0.4	0.2	4.0	3.5
SAT Math score	686.1	679.6	564.5	566.6	665.0	660.0
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	672.5	569.9	567.8	660.1	654.4
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	627.4	444.9	443.6	604.0	595.6
	[618.0, 714.0]	[595.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[315.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 18 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to 1 times the coefficient on African American.

19

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

4 Combined Simulation 3 by year

Table 23: Class of 2023 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	68.4	40.3	46.4	59.5	64.2
African American	6.8	5.2	29.9	18.6	11.2	7.7
Hispanic	10.8	10.9	19.1	22.3	12.3	13.1
Asian American	14.9	12.2	5.1	6.6	13.0	11.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.8	4.4	4.4	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	25.8	45.3	68.6	21.3	34.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.3	8.1	7.5	9.5	9.0
First Generation College	2.6	6.9	11.6	26.9	4.3	10.8
Attended Private HS	25.8	18.4	20.4	13.5	24.8	17.5
% FRPL of HS	21.8	26.3	31.4	36.1	23.7	28.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.3	1.4	0.6	4.5	3.6
SAT Math score	715.1	708.1	584.8	581.5	690.3	683.9
	[660.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	708.4	599.6	593.3	692.5	686.5
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	585.1	421.6	437.7	551.9	557.0
	[470.0, 694.0]	[474.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[308.0, 622.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 19 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .5 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .5 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 24: Class of 2024 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	69.9	38.2	46.0	61.2	65.8
African American	6.8	5.1	31.0	21.3	11.0	7.9
Hispanic	10.3	10.8	20.4	22.1	12.0	12.8
Asian American	13.1	10.7	6.3	7.0	11.9	10.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.4	3.5	2.7	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	22.2	38.7	61.8	17.6	29.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.1	8.3	7.8	9.4	8.8
First Generation College	2.3	5.9	13.6	27.7	4.2	9.7
Attended Private HS	23.4	16.2	22.9	17.1	23.3	16.3
% FRPL of HS	22.9	26.9	30.7	34.6	24.2	28.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.1	1.6	1.2	5.3	4.5
SAT Math score	711.0	704.0	574.6	574.6	687.6	681.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	705.2	588.9	585.9	690.6	684.7
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	587.3	420.5	430.7	556.6	560.4
	[476.0, 694.0]	[484.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[298.0, 591.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 20 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .5 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .5 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 25: Class of 2025 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	67.7	34.2	49.6	57.9	64.3
African American	5.8	3.9	31.8	20.9	10.7	7.1
Hispanic	11.4	11.0	21.4	17.5	13.3	12.2
Asian American	16.5	14.8	8.5	8.9	15.0	13.7
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.4	3.5	2.0	2.1	1.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.1	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	24.5	34.8	62.3	18.4	31.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.9	9.2	8.9	10.1	9.7
First Generation College	2.7	5.3	6.7	14.7	3.4	7.1
Attended Private HS	23.3	18.0	20.4	16.5	22.7	17.7
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.6	26.1	28.1	22.9	25.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.2	0.9	0.5	5.7	5.1
SAT Math score	684.1	680.1	566.9	578.0	662.0	660.8
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	669.2	576.7	580.1	656.0	652.4
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	627.2	486.4	485.4	605.0	600.4
	[603.0, 714.0]	[591.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 644.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 21 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .5 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .5 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 26: Class of 2026 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	66.8	28.3	40.5	56.6	62.2
African American	7.0	4.9	36.6	26.3	12.2	8.6
Hispanic	10.5	10.6	19.1	19.6	12.0	12.1
Asian American	15.6	14.0	11.3	9.4	14.9	13.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	1.1	1.7	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	26.5	40.3	67.6	19.5	33.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.7	9.3	8.9	9.9	9.5
First Generation College	3.2	7.9	15.7	28.9	5.4	11.6
Attended Private HS	21.8	16.4	21.3	17.2	21.7	16.5
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.1	25.2	27.7	23.1	25.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.1	0.4	0.1	4.0	3.4
SAT Math score	686.1	678.8	564.5	566.2	665.0	659.3
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	671.4	569.9	567.6	660.1	653.4
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	626.2	444.9	442.1	604.0	594.3
	[618.0, 714.0]	[591.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[318.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 22 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .5 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .5 times the coefficient on African American.

5   Combined Simulation 4 by year

Table 27: Class of 2023 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	68.4	40.3	46.4	59.5	64.2
African American	6.8	5.2	29.9	18.6	11.2	7.7
Hispanic	10.8	10.9	19.1	22.2	12.3	13.1
Asian American	14.9	12.2	5.1	6.7	13.0	11.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.8	4.4	4.4	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	25.8	45.3	68.6	21.3	34.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.3	8.1	7.5	9.5	9.0
First Generation College	2.6	7.0	11.6	26.9	4.3	10.8
Attended Private HS	25.8	18.4	20.4	13.5	24.8	17.4
% FRPL of HS	21.8	26.3	31.4	36.1	23.7	28.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.8	1.4	0.9	4.5	3.2
SAT Math score	715.1	708.1	584.8	581.5	690.3	683.9
	[660.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	708.5	599.6	593.4	692.5	686.5
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	585.3	421.6	437.6	551.9	557.1
	[470.0, 694.0]	[474.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[308.0, 622.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 23 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

Table 28: Class of 2024 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	69.9	38.2	46.0	61.2	65.8
African American	6.8	5.1	31.0	21.3	11.0	7.9
Hispanic	10.3	10.8	20.4	22.1	12.0	12.8
Asian American	13.1	10.6	6.3	7.0	11.9	10.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.4	3.5	2.7	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	22.2	38.7	61.8	17.6	29.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.1	8.3	7.8	9.4	8.8
First Generation College	2.3	5.9	13.6	27.7	4.2	9.7
Attended Private HS	23.4	16.1	22.9	17.1	23.3	16.3
% FRPL of HS	22.9	26.9	30.7	34.6	24.2	28.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.7	1.6	1.5	5.3	4.1
SAT Math score	711.0	704.0	574.6	574.6	687.6	681.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	705.2	588.9	585.9	690.6	684.7
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	587.3	420.5	430.4	556.6	560.4
	[476.0, 694.0]	[484.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[297.0, 591.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 24 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

Table 29: Class of 2025 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	67.6	34.2	49.6	57.9	64.2
African American	5.8	3.9	31.8	20.9	10.7	7.1
Hispanic	11.4	11.0	21.4	17.5	13.3	12.2
Asian American	16.5	14.9	8.5	8.9	15.0	13.7
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.4	3.5	2.0	2.1	1.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.1	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	24.6	34.8	62.3	18.4	31.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.9	9.2	8.9	10.1	9.7
First Generation College	2.7	5.3	6.7	14.7	3.4	7.1
Attended Private HS	23.3	17.9	20.4	16.5	22.7	17.6
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.7	26.1	28.1	22.9	25.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.5	0.9	0.7	5.7	4.6
SAT Math score	684.1	679.8	566.9	578.1	662.0	660.7
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	669.0	576.7	580.1	656.0	652.2
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	626.9	486.4	485.4	605.0	600.2
	[603.0, 714.0]	[591.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 644.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 25 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

Table 30: Class of 2026 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	66.7	28.3	40.5	56.6	62.2
African American	7.0	4.9	36.6	26.3	12.2	8.6
Hispanic	10.5	10.6	19.1	19.6	12.0	12.2
Asian American	15.6	14.0	11.3	9.5	14.9	13.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	1.1	1.7	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	26.5	40.3	67.6	19.5	33.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.7	9.3	8.9	9.9	9.5
First Generation College	3.2	8.0	15.7	28.9	5.4	11.6
Attended Private HS	21.8	16.4	21.3	17.2	21.7	16.5
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.1	25.2	27.7	23.1	25.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.5	0.4	0.2	4.0	3.0
SAT Math score	686.1	678.7	564.5	566.2	665.0	659.2
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	671.3	569.9	567.6	660.1	653.3
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	626.1	444.9	442.2	604.0	594.2
	[618.0, 714.0]	[591.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[318.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 26 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

6 Combined Simulation 5 by year

Table 31: Class of 2023 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	67.0	40.3	45.0	59.5	62.8
African American	6.8	5.1	29.9	18.4	11.2	7.7
Hispanic	10.8	11.5	19.1	23.8	12.3	13.9
Asian American	14.9	12.8	5.1	6.8	13.0	11.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.0	4.4	4.5	2.6	2.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	27.5	45.3	71.0	21.3	35.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.0	8.1	7.3	9.5	8.7
First Generation College	2.6	7.4	11.6	27.9	4.3	11.3
Attended Private HS	25.8	16.4	20.4	12.4	24.8	15.7
% FRPL of HS	21.8	27.4	31.4	37.4	23.7	29.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	1.8	7.6	0.5	11.8	1.6
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.1	1.4	1.0	4.5	3.5
SAT Math score	715.1	712.9	584.8	582.6	690.3	688.0
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	713.8	599.6	595.4	692.5	691.3
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 780.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	601.0	421.6	449.3	551.9	572.1
	[470.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[320.0, 628.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 27 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

Table 32: Class of 2024 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	69.1	38.2	45.2	61.2	65.0
African American	6.8	4.8	31.0	20.3	11.0	7.5
Hispanic	10.3	11.3	20.4	23.2	12.0	13.3
Asian American	13.1	11.0	6.3	7.3	11.9	10.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.5	3.5	3.0	2.9	2.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.3	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	23.7	38.7	65.5	17.6	30.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.5	8.3	7.5	9.4	8.3
First Generation College	2.3	6.3	13.6	29.2	4.2	10.2
Attended Private HS	23.4	15.1	22.9	14.2	23.3	14.9
% FRPL of HS	22.9	27.9	30.7	36.0	24.2	29.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	2.9	8.6	0.5	13.6	2.5
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.8	1.6	1.7	5.3	4.3
SAT Math score	711.0	708.8	574.6	575.6	687.6	686.0
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	711.1	588.9	588.6	690.6	690.1
	[660.0, 770.0]	[670.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	604.7	420.5	444.7	556.6	577.2
	[476.0, 694.0]	[524.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[315.0, 618.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 28 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

Table 33: Class of 2025 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	67.3	34.2	49.7	57.9	64.0
African American	5.8	3.8	31.8	20.5	10.7	7.0
Hispanic	11.4	11.2	21.4	17.3	13.3	12.3
Asian American	16.5	15.0	8.5	9.3	15.0	14.0
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.5	3.5	2.1	2.1	1.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.7	1.1	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	25.6	34.8	64.0	18.4	32.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.6	9.2	8.9	10.1	9.4
First Generation College	2.7	5.6	6.7	14.9	3.4	7.3
Attended Private HS	23.3	16.9	20.4	16.1	22.7	16.8
% FRPL of HS	22.2	25.3	26.1	28.3	22.9	25.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	3.7	5.0	1.2	11.9	3.2
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.6	0.9	0.8	5.7	4.7
SAT Math score	684.1	685.3	566.9	579.7	662.0	665.4
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	675.0	576.7	582.2	656.0	657.5
	[640.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	635.7	486.4	491.1	605.0	608.4
	[603.0, 714.0]	[616.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[356.0, 649.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 29 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

27

Table 34: Class of 2026 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	65.3	28.3	40.0	56.6	60.9
African American	7.0	5.3	36.6	25.9	12.2	8.9
Hispanic	10.5	11.0	19.1	19.9	12.0	12.6
Asian American	15.6	14.4	11.3	9.9	14.9	13.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.1	4.0	3.1	2.7	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.9	0.7	1.2	1.7	1.8
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	27.9	40.3	69.9	19.5	35.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.5	9.3	8.8	9.9	9.4
First Generation College	3.2	8.4	15.7	29.3	5.4	12.0
Attended Private HS	21.8	15.4	21.3	16.8	21.7	15.6
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.7	25.2	27.9	23.1	26.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	3.5	5.1	0.8	11.0	3.0
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.7	0.4	0.2	4.0	3.1
SAT Math score	686.1	680.9	564.5	567.8	665.0	661.3
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	674.2	569.9	570.2	660.1	656.2
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	632.0	444.9	446.7	604.0	599.9
	[618.0, 714.0]	[610.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[320.0, 603.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 30 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

7   Combined Simulation 6 by year

Table 35: Class of 2023 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	68.2	40.3	47.0	59.5	64.1
African American	6.8	5.1	29.9	18.5	11.2	7.7
Hispanic	10.8	11.6	19.1	22.2	12.3	13.6
Asian American	14.9	11.7	5.1	6.0	13.0	10.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.9	4.4	4.5	2.6	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	27.2	45.3	68.8	21.3	35.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.1	8.1	7.5	9.5	8.8
First Generation College	2.6	7.4	11.6	26.4	4.3	11.0
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.7	20.4	19.9	24.8	23.8
% FRPL of HS	21.8	25.1	31.4	33.5	23.7	26.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.2	1.4	0.6	4.5	3.5
SAT Math score	715.1	705.6	584.8	580.5	690.3	681.7
	[660.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	707.4	599.6	592.6	692.5	685.5
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	585.5	421.6	433.3	551.9	556.5
	[470.0, 694.0]	[476.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[304.0, 621.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 23 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.5 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 36: Class of 2024 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	69.5	38.2	46.2	61.2	65.5
African American	6.8	5.1	31.0	21.0	11.0	7.9
Hispanic	10.3	11.3	20.4	22.3	12.0	13.2
Asian American	13.1	10.6	6.3	7.0	11.9	10.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.7	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	23.3	38.7	61.6	17.6	29.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.9	8.3	7.9	9.4	8.7
First Generation College	2.3	6.5	13.6	28.8	4.2	10.4
Attended Private HS	23.4	22.2	22.9	24.1	23.3	22.5
% FRPL of HS	22.9	25.7	30.7	31.9	24.2	26.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.2	1.6	1.2	5.3	4.5
SAT Math score	711.0	702.5	574.6	573.0	687.6	680.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	704.6	588.9	585.3	690.6	684.1
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	586.9	420.5	423.8	556.6	558.9
	[476.0, 694.0]	[494.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[296.0, 567.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 24 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.5 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 37: Class of 2025 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	67.3	34.2	48.7	57.9	63.8
African American	5.8	4.2	31.8	21.1	10.7	7.4
Hispanic	11.4	11.6	21.4	18.1	13.3	12.8
Asian American	16.5	14.1	8.5	8.5	15.0	13.0
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.7	3.5	2.3	2.1	1.9
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.2	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	25.3	34.8	60.4	18.4	32.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.7	9.2	8.9	10.1	9.6
First Generation College	2.7	5.6	6.7	14.9	3.4	7.4
Attended Private HS	23.3	24.1	20.4	20.5	22.7	23.4
% FRPL of HS	22.2	23.6	26.1	26.7	22.9	24.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.0	0.9	0.4	5.7	4.9
SAT Math score	684.1	676.9	566.9	576.9	662.0	658.0
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	667.2	576.7	579.2	656.0	650.6
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	626.6	486.4	487.8	605.0	600.4
	[603.0, 714.0]	[591.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[350.0, 646.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 25 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.5 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 38: Class of 2026 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	66.6	28.3	40.4	56.6	62.1
African American	7.0	5.1	36.6	26.8	12.2	8.8
Hispanic	10.5	11.0	19.1	19.5	12.0	12.5
Asian American	15.6	13.5	11.3	9.4	14.9	12.8
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	2.9	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	0.9	1.7	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	28.2	40.3	67.2	19.5	35.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.5	9.3	8.9	9.9	9.4
First Generation College	3.2	8.4	15.7	28.5	5.4	11.9
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.3	21.3	20.4	21.7	22.0
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.0	25.2	26.7	23.1	24.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.2	0.4	0.3	4.0	3.5
SAT Math score	686.1	674.8	564.5	565.4	665.0	655.9
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	668.9	569.9	566.9	660.1	651.2
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	622.1	444.9	443.6	604.0	591.1
	[618.0, 714.0]	[583.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[318.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 26 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.5 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

8 Combined Simulation 7 by year

Table 39: Class of 2023 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	68.2	40.3	44.9	59.5	63.7
African American	6.8	5.1	29.9	20.3	11.2	8.0
Hispanic	10.8	11.6	19.1	21.1	12.3	13.4
Asian American	14.9	11.7	5.1	7.2	13.0	10.8
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.9	4.4	5.1	2.6	2.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.6	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	27.2	45.3	87.1	21.3	38.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.1	8.1	7.9	9.5	8.9
First Generation College	2.6	7.4	11.6	14.3	4.3	8.7
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.7	20.4	18.5	24.8	23.5
% FRPL of HS	21.8	25.1	31.4	31.1	23.7	26.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.2	1.4	1.0	4.5	3.6
SAT Math score	715.1	705.6	584.8	582.5	690.3	682.1
	[660.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	707.4	599.6	594.7	692.5	685.9
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	585.5	421.6	429.1	551.9	555.6
	[470.0, 694.0]	[476.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[301.0, 589.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 35 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

Table 40: Class of 2024 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	69.5	38.2	45.3	61.2	65.4
African American	6.8	5.1	31.0	22.4	11.0	8.1
Hispanic	10.3	11.3	20.4	21.2	12.0	13.0
Asian American	13.1	10.6	6.3	7.8	11.9	10.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.6	2.9	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	23.3	38.7	81.7	17.6	33.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.9	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.8
First Generation College	2.3	6.5	13.6	18.4	4.2	8.6
Attended Private HS	23.4	22.2	22.9	20.6	23.3	22.0
% FRPL of HS	22.9	25.7	30.7	31.6	24.2	26.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.2	1.6	1.5	5.3	4.5
SAT Math score	711.0	702.5	574.6	578.8	687.6	681.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	704.6	588.9	589.0	690.6	684.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	586.9	420.5	429.2	556.6	559.9
	[476.0, 694.0]	[494.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[297.0, 570.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 36 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

Table 41: Class of 2025 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	67.3	34.2	50.4	57.9	64.1
African American	5.8	4.2	31.8	20.5	10.7	7.2
Hispanic	11.4	11.6	21.4	16.4	13.3	12.5
Asian American	16.5	14.1	8.5	9.7	15.0	13.3
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.7	3.5	2.0	2.1	1.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	0.9	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	25.3	34.8	80.5	18.4	35.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.7	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.6
First Generation College	2.7	5.6	6.7	9.1	3.4	6.3
Attended Private HS	23.3	24.1	20.4	17.6	22.7	22.9
% FRPL of HS	22.2	23.6	26.1	26.7	22.9	24.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.0	0.9	0.8	5.7	5.0
SAT Math score	684.1	676.9	566.9	587.2	662.0	660.0
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 660.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	667.2	576.7	585.1	656.0	651.7
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	626.6	486.4	487.6	605.0	600.4
	[603.0, 714.0]	[591.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[350.0, 644.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 37 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

Table 42: Class of 2026 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	66.6	28.3	42.9	56.6	62.5
African American	7.0	5.1	36.6	26.0	12.2	8.7
Hispanic	10.5	11.0	19.1	17.7	12.0	12.2
Asian American	15.6	13.5	11.3	9.7	14.9	12.8
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	0.8	1.7	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	28.2	40.3	81.3	19.5	37.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.5	9.3	8.9	9.9	9.4
First Generation College	3.2	8.4	15.7	20.2	5.4	10.5
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.3	21.3	19.9	21.7	21.9
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.0	25.2	26.0	23.1	24.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.2	0.4	0.4	4.0	3.5
SAT Math score	686.1	674.8	564.5	573.9	665.0	657.3
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	668.9	569.9	574.8	660.1	652.6
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	622.1	444.9	453.6	604.0	592.9
	[618.0, 714.0]	[583.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[323.0, 612.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 38 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

9   Combined Simulation 8 by year

Table 43: Class of 2023 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	67.7	40.3	51.1	59.5	61.4
African American	6.8	5.0	29.9	14.4	11.2	8.6
Hispanic	10.8	11.8	19.1	20.0	12.3	14.9
Asian American	14.9	11.9	5.1	10.1	13.0	11.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.0	4.4	3.5	2.6	2.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.0	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	29.7	45.3	89.2	21.3	52.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.0	8.1	8.0	9.5	8.6
First Generation College	2.6	8.2	11.6	12.5	4.3	9.8
Attended Private HS	25.8	25.3	20.4	16.1	24.8	21.8
% FRPL of HS	21.8	25.4	31.4	31.4	23.7	27.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.8	7.6	3.1	11.8	9.1
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.1	1.4	1.4	4.5	3.1
SAT Math score	715.1	708.9	584.8	612.9	690.3	672.3
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[550.0, 670.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	710.1	599.6	622.1	692.5	676.5
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[570.0, 680.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	593.6	421.6	448.2	551.9	538.1
	[470.0, 694.0]	[492.0, 695.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[323.0, 622.0]		
N	1,099	840	259	518	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

Table 44: Class of 2024 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	69.2	38.2	51.3	61.2	63.0
African American	6.8	5.0	31.0	15.4	11.0	8.6
Hispanic	10.3	11.6	20.4	20.4	12.0	14.6
Asian American	13.1	10.8	6.3	9.3	11.9	10.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.2	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	24.7	38.7	75.6	17.6	42.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.7	8.3	8.1	9.4	8.5
First Generation College	2.3	6.9	13.6	14.8	4.2	9.6
Attended Private HS	23.4	22.6	22.9	20.1	23.3	21.7
% FRPL of HS	22.9	26.2	30.7	29.8	24.2	27.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	13.9	8.6	3.8	13.6	10.4
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.2	1.6	1.9	5.3	4.1
SAT Math score	711.0	706.5	574.6	607.4	687.6	672.5
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[560.0, 660.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	708.9	588.9	616.0	690.6	677.0
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 780.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[560.0, 680.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	595.4	420.5	446.1	556.6	544.2
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[323.0, 597.0]		
N	1,173	930	243	486	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

Table 45: Class of 2025 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	67.2	34.2	55.2	57.9	62.7
African American	5.8	3.9	31.8	15.9	10.7	8.4
Hispanic	11.4	11.8	21.4	15.0	13.3	13.0
Asian American	16.5	14.0	8.5	10.6	15.0	12.7
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.8	3.5	2.2	2.1	1.9
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.3	0.7	1.2	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	28.7	34.8	60.5	18.4	40.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.5	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.4
First Generation College	2.7	6.4	6.7	7.4	3.4	6.8
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.9	20.4	18.0	22.7	21.7
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.2	26.1	25.9	22.9	24.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.9	5.0	2.9	11.9	9.8
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.3	0.9	1.4	5.7	4.4
SAT Math score	684.1	679.2	566.9	592.1	662.0	646.3
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 670.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	667.8	576.7	594.0	656.0	640.0
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[550.0, 670.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	629.9	486.4	509.6	605.0	584.5
	[603.0, 714.0]	[602.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[361.0, 665.0]		
N	1,105	848	257	514	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

Table 46: Class of 2026 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	66.2	28.3	49.9	56.6	60.5
African American	7.0	5.3	36.6	19.7	12.2	10.3
Hispanic	10.5	11.1	19.1	16.6	12.0	13.0
Asian American	15.6	13.7	11.3	10.0	14.9	12.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	1.9	4.0	2.5	2.7	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.9	0.7	1.2	1.7	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	31.9	40.3	67.1	19.5	44.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.3	9.3	8.9	9.9	9.2
First Generation College	3.2	9.9	15.7	16.6	5.4	12.2
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.0	21.3	19.7	21.7	21.2
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.6	25.2	25.8	23.1	25.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	11.6	5.1	3.1	11.0	8.7
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.3	0.4	0.8	4.0	3.1
SAT Math score	686.1	676.8	564.5	582.7	665.0	644.2
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	671.1	569.9	586.7	660.1	641.9
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	630.8	444.9	470.6	604.0	575.3
	[618.0, 714.0]	[608.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[337.0, 631.0]		
N	1,155	913	242	484	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

37

10   Combined Simulation 9 by year

Table 47: Class of 2023 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	63.3	40.3	38.1	59.5	58.5
African American	6.8	6.1	29.9	22.7	11.2	9.3
Hispanic	10.8	15.7	19.1	26.1	12.3	17.7
Asian American	14.9	10.8	5.1	5.9	13.0	9.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.6	4.4	5.7	2.6	3.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	29.3	45.3	87.2	21.3	40.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.0	8.1	7.9	9.5	8.8
First Generation College	2.6	8.3	11.6	15.6	4.3	9.7
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.5	20.4	18.9	24.8	23.5
% FRPL of HS	21.8	25.7	31.4	31.2	23.7	26.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.0	1.4	0.8	4.5	3.4
SAT Math score	715.1	704.4	584.8	577.5	690.3	680.2
	[660.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	706.2	599.6	589.9	692.5	684.0
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	587.8	421.6	424.2	551.9	556.6
	[470.0, 694.0]	[479.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[295.0, 584.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 48: Class of 2024 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	64.6	38.2	38.5	61.2	60.1
African American	6.8	6.3	31.0	25.2	11.0	9.5
Hispanic	10.3	15.1	20.4	26.0	12.0	17.0
Asian American	13.1	9.9	6.3	6.6	11.9	9.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	3.1	3.5	3.1	2.9	3.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.0	0.5	0.6	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	25.3	38.7	81.7	17.6	35.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.9	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.7
First Generation College	2.3	7.5	13.6	19.8	4.2	9.6
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.9	22.9	20.8	23.3	21.7
% FRPL of HS	22.9	26.4	30.7	32.2	24.2	27.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.0	1.6	1.5	5.3	4.4
SAT Math score	711.0	701.4	574.6	573.1	687.6	679.4
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	704.0	588.9	582.8	690.6	683.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	588.9	420.5	429.1	556.6	561.4
	[476.0, 694.0]	[501.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[296.0, 581.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 49: Class of 2025 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	63.0	34.2	43.8	57.9	59.4
African American	5.8	5.0	31.8	23.4	10.7	8.5
Hispanic	11.4	15.5	21.4	21.6	13.3	16.6
Asian American	16.5	13.1	8.5	7.9	15.0	12.2
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	2.3	3.5	2.5	2.1	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.7	0.8	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	27.7	34.8	80.5	18.4	37.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.6	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.5
First Generation College	2.7	6.5	6.7	10.2	3.4	7.2
Attended Private HS	23.3	24.2	20.4	18.5	22.7	23.1
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.0	26.1	26.6	22.9	24.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.9	0.9	0.6	5.7	4.9
SAT Math score	684.1	674.2	566.9	580.6	662.0	656.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	664.5	576.7	580.4	656.0	648.7
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	626.5	486.4	482.7	605.0	599.4
	[603.0, 714.0]	[591.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 638.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 50: Class of 2026 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	61.8	28.3	35.1	56.6	57.2
African American	7.0	6.6	36.6	30.1	12.2	10.7
Hispanic	10.5	14.8	19.1	22.1	12.0	16.1
Asian American	15.6	12.5	11.3	8.3	14.9	11.8
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.6	4.0	3.7	2.7	2.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.7	0.7	0.7	1.7	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	30.8	40.3	81.3	19.5	39.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.4	9.3	9.0	9.9	9.3
First Generation College	3.2	9.8	15.7	21.7	5.4	11.8
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.3	21.3	20.2	21.7	22.0
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.5	25.2	26.1	23.1	24.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.1	0.4	0.3	4.0	3.4
SAT Math score	686.1	672.1	564.5	567.7	665.0	654.0
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	666.5	569.9	568.5	660.1	649.5
	[630.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	620.5	444.9	444.9	604.0	590.1
	[618.0, 714.0]	[581.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[318.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

11   Combined Simulation 10 by year

Table 51: Class of 2023 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	59.2	40.3	33.5	59.5	54.3
African American	6.8	7.0	29.9	24.2	11.2	10.3
Hispanic	10.8	19.2	19.1	29.7	12.3	21.2
Asian American	14.9	10.1	5.1	5.0	13.0	9.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	3.1	4.4	6.1	2.6	3.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	31.1	45.3	87.1	21.3	41.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.0	8.1	8.0	9.5	8.8
First Generation College	2.6	9.1	11.6	16.6	4.3	10.5
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.4	20.4	19.3	24.8	23.4
% FRPL of HS	21.8	26.2	31.4	31.2	23.7	27.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.9	1.4	0.7	4.5	3.3
SAT Math score	715.1	703.5	584.8	574.0	690.3	678.8
	[660.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	705.2	599.6	586.7	692.5	682.6
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	589.8	421.6	419.5	551.9	557.3
	[470.0, 694.0]	[487.0, 695.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[288.0, 572.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 52: Class of 2024 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	60.4	38.2	33.8	61.2	55.9
African American	6.8	7.2	31.0	27.3	11.0	10.6
Hispanic	10.3	18.4	20.4	29.2	12.0	20.2
Asian American	13.1	9.3	6.3	5.8	11.9	8.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	3.7	3.5	3.4	2.9	3.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.0	0.5	0.5	1.0	0.9
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	27.0	38.7	81.7	17.6	36.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.8	8.3	7.9	9.4	8.7
First Generation College	2.3	8.4	13.6	21.0	4.2	10.5
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.6	22.9	21.0	23.3	21.5
% FRPL of HS	22.9	27.1	30.7	32.5	24.2	28.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.9	1.6	1.4	5.3	4.3
SAT Math score	711.0	700.5	574.6	568.9	687.6	677.9
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	703.4	588.9	578.3	690.6	682.0
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	590.6	420.5	429.0	556.6	562.9
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[292.0, 581.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 53: Class of 2025 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	59.3	34.2	38.5	57.9	55.4
African American	5.8	5.7	31.8	25.5	10.7	9.4
Hispanic	11.4	18.8	21.4	25.8	13.3	20.2
Asian American	16.5	12.4	8.5	6.6	15.0	11.3
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	2.7	3.5	2.9	2.1	2.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.7	0.7	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	29.8	34.8	80.5	18.4	39.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.6	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.5
First Generation College	2.7	7.3	6.7	11.0	3.4	8.0
Attended Private HS	23.3	24.3	20.4	19.1	22.7	23.3
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.4	26.1	26.4	22.9	24.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.8	0.9	0.5	5.7	4.8
SAT Math score	684.1	671.9	566.9	575.8	662.0	653.8
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	662.2	576.7	577.0	656.0	646.1
	[640.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	626.4	486.4	479.6	605.0	598.7
	[603.0, 714.0]	[591.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 636.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 54: Class of 2026 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	57.7	28.3	29.6	56.6	52.9
African American	7.0	7.9	36.6	33.2	12.2	12.3
Hispanic	10.5	18.1	19.1	25.2	12.0	19.3
Asian American	15.6	11.7	11.3	7.3	14.9	10.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	3.0	4.0	4.2	2.7	3.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.5	0.7	0.5	1.7	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	33.1	40.3	81.3	19.5	41.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.3	9.3	9.1	9.9	9.3
First Generation College	3.2	11.0	15.7	22.5	5.4	13.0
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.4	21.3	20.4	21.7	22.0
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.8	25.2	26.0	23.1	25.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.1	0.4	0.2	4.0	3.4
SAT Math score	686.1	669.7	564.5	563.4	665.0	651.3
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	664.4	569.9	563.9	660.1	647.0
	[630.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	619.2	444.9	437.4	604.0	587.7
	[618.0, 714.0]	[578.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[314.0, 594.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

12 Combined Simulation 11 by year

Table 55: Class of 2023 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	52.7	40.3	27.6	59.5	47.9
African American	6.8	8.2	29.9	26.1	11.2	11.6
Hispanic	10.8	24.9	19.1	34.5	12.3	26.8
Asian American	14.9	8.9	5.1	3.9	13.0	8.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	4.1	4.4	6.7	2.6	4.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	34.0	45.3	87.1	21.3	44.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.9	8.1	8.1	9.5	8.7
First Generation College	2.6	10.4	11.6	18.1	4.3	11.9
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.1	20.4	20.1	24.8	23.3
% FRPL of HS	21.8	27.0	31.4	30.8	23.7	27.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.6	1.4	0.5	4.5	3.0
SAT Math score	715.1	702.2	584.8	569.5	690.3	676.9
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	703.6	599.6	582.6	692.5	680.6
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	593.2	421.6	411.1	551.9	558.5
	[470.0, 694.0]	[494.0, 697.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[287.0, 543.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Table 56: Class of 2024 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	53.7	38.2	27.7	61.2	49.3
African American	6.8	8.6	31.0	30.3	11.0	12.3
Hispanic	10.3	23.8	20.4	33.1	12.0	25.4
Asian American	13.1	8.2	6.3	4.7	11.9	7.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	4.8	3.5	3.8	2.9	4.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	0.9	0.5	0.4	1.0	0.8
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	29.9	38.7	81.7	17.6	38.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.7	8.3	7.9	9.4	8.6
First Generation College	2.3	9.9	13.6	22.7	4.2	12.1
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.0	22.9	21.3	23.3	21.1
% FRPL of HS	22.9	28.2	30.7	32.7	24.2	29.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.6	1.6	1.2	5.3	4.0
SAT Math score	711.0	699.0	574.6	563.1	687.6	675.7
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 600.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	702.6	588.9	572.2	690.6	680.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	593.6	420.5	428.7	556.6	565.3
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[290.0, 597.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 57: Class of 2025 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	53.4	34.2	31.2	57.9	49.2
African American	5.8	6.7	31.8	28.2	10.7	10.8
Hispanic	11.4	24.4	21.4	31.7	13.3	25.8
Asian American	16.5	11.1	8.5	5.0	15.0	10.0
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	3.5	3.5	3.3	2.1	3.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.0	0.7	0.6	1.0	0.9
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	33.5	34.8	80.5	18.4	42.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.4	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.4
First Generation College	2.7	8.8	6.7	11.7	3.4	9.4
Attended Private HS	23.3	24.3	20.4	20.0	22.7	23.4
% FRPL of HS	22.2	25.0	26.1	26.0	22.9	25.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.6	0.9	0.3	5.7	4.6
SAT Math score	684.1	668.3	566.9	569.5	662.0	649.7
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	658.4	576.7	572.6	656.0	642.2
	[640.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	626.1	486.4	476.5	605.0	597.9
	[603.0, 714.0]	[590.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 633.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 58: Class of 2026 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	51.3	28.3	22.6	56.6	46.3
African American	7.0	10.0	36.6	37.7	12.2	14.8
Hispanic	10.5	23.4	19.1	28.7	12.0	24.3
Asian American	15.6	10.4	11.3	5.8	14.9	9.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	3.6	4.0	4.8	2.7	3.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.3	0.7	0.3	1.7	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	37.0	40.3	81.3	19.5	44.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.2	9.3	9.1	9.9	9.2
First Generation College	3.2	13.0	15.7	23.3	5.4	14.8
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.3	21.3	20.7	21.7	22.1
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.5	25.2	25.8	23.1	25.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.1	0.4	0.1	4.0	3.4
SAT Math score	686.1	665.8	564.5	557.8	665.0	647.1
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 590.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	660.8	569.9	557.8	660.1	643.0
	[630.0, 730.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[510.0, 610.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	617.2	444.9	425.1	604.0	583.9
	[618.0, 714.0]	[567.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[303.0, 559.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

46

13   Combined Simulation 12 by year

Table 59: Class of 2023 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	66.3	40.3	44.4	59.5	62.2
African American	6.8	5.4	29.9	20.1	11.2	8.2
Hispanic	10.8	12.4	19.1	21.5	12.3	14.2
Asian American	14.9	12.3	5.1	7.0	13.0	11.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.1	4.4	5.1	2.6	2.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.8	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	36.3	45.3	87.2	21.3	46.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.9	8.1	7.9	9.5	8.7
First Generation College	2.6	9.0	11.6	14.9	4.3	10.1
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.2	20.4	19.8	24.8	23.3
% FRPL of HS	21.8	26.1	31.4	30.3	23.7	26.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.8	1.4	0.8	4.5	3.2
SAT Math score	715.1	704.1	584.8	580.0	690.3	680.5
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	705.7	599.6	591.5	692.5	683.9
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	587.6	421.6	421.4	551.9	555.9
	[470.0, 694.0]	[479.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[290.0, 567.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Table 60: Class of 2024 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	67.8	38.2	44.2	61.2	63.7
African American	6.8	5.4	31.0	22.9	11.0	8.4
Hispanic	10.3	12.4	20.4	21.4	12.0	13.9
Asian American	13.1	11.1	6.3	8.2	11.9	10.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.6	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	31.2	38.7	81.7	17.6	39.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.8	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.7
First Generation College	2.3	8.1	13.6	20.0	4.2	10.1
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.7	22.9	21.2	23.3	21.6
% FRPL of HS	22.9	26.6	30.7	31.4	24.2	27.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.8	1.6	1.6	5.3	4.3
SAT Math score	711.0	700.1	574.6	572.0	687.6	678.1
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	702.8	588.9	582.3	690.6	682.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	587.6	420.5	423.8	556.6	559.5
	[476.0, 694.0]	[494.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[292.0, 567.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 61: Class of 2025 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	65.5	34.2	48.1	57.9	62.2
African American	5.8	4.4	31.8	21.2	10.7	7.5
Hispanic	11.4	12.6	21.4	18.9	13.3	13.8
Asian American	16.5	14.6	8.5	8.8	15.0	13.5
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.7	3.5	2.1	2.1	1.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	34.5	34.8	80.5	18.4	43.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.6	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.5
First Generation College	2.7	6.8	6.7	9.3	3.4	7.2
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.4	20.4	18.8	22.7	22.5
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.3	26.1	26.3	22.9	24.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.6	0.9	0.6	5.7	4.7
SAT Math score	684.1	674.9	566.9	583.4	662.0	657.7
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	664.4	576.7	582.3	656.0	648.9
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	625.3	486.4	480.2	605.0	597.9
	[603.0, 714.0]	[589.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[348.0, 636.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 62: Class of 2026 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	64.5	28.3	39.4	56.6	60.2
African American	7.0	5.7	36.6	27.9	12.2	9.5
Hispanic	10.5	11.9	19.1	18.4	12.0	13.0
Asian American	15.6	14.3	11.3	10.3	14.9	13.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	1.8	4.0	3.3	2.7	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.7	0.7	0.7	1.7	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	38.4	40.3	81.3	19.5	45.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.3	9.3	9.1	9.9	9.3
First Generation College	3.2	10.6	15.7	21.5	5.4	12.5
Attended Private HS	21.8	21.7	21.3	20.4	21.7	21.5
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.6	25.2	25.6	23.1	24.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.7	0.4	0.2	4.0	3.1
SAT Math score	686.1	671.3	564.5	571.2	665.0	654.0
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	665.4	569.9	571.4	660.1	649.1
	[630.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	618.9	444.9	443.5	604.0	588.5
	[618.0, 714.0]	[571.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[315.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

49

14   Combined Simulation 13 by year

Table 63: Class of 2023 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	64.9	40.3	44.3	59.5	60.9
African American	6.8	5.6	29.9	19.9	11.2	8.3
Hispanic	10.8	13.1	19.1	21.8	12.3	14.7
Asian American	14.9	12.9	5.1	6.9	13.0	11.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.2	4.4	5.1	2.6	2.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.4	1.2	2.1	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	43.5	45.3	87.1	21.3	51.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.7	8.1	8.0	9.5	8.6
First Generation College	2.6	10.2	11.6	15.3	4.3	11.2
Attended Private HS	25.8	23.7	20.4	20.8	24.8	23.2
% FRPL of HS	21.8	26.9	31.4	29.7	23.7	27.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.4	1.4	0.7	4.5	2.9
SAT Math score	715.1	703.3	584.8	578.9	690.3	679.6
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	704.6	599.6	589.6	692.5	682.7
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	589.7	421.6	414.2	551.9	556.2
	[470.0, 694.0]	[489.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[288.0, 543.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 64: Class of 2024 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	66.2	38.2	43.5	61.2	62.3
African American	6.8	5.7	31.0	23.5	11.0	8.7
Hispanic	10.3	13.3	20.4	21.3	12.0	14.7
Asian American	13.1	11.4	6.3	8.5	11.9	10.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.5	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.0	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	37.7	38.7	81.7	17.6	45.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.7	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.6
First Generation College	2.3	9.4	13.6	21.1	4.2	11.4
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.2	22.9	21.8	23.3	21.3
% FRPL of HS	22.9	27.4	30.7	31.2	24.2	28.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.6	1.6	1.7	5.3	4.1
SAT Math score	711.0	698.3	574.6	567.5	687.6	675.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	701.5	588.9	577.9	690.6	680.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	588.4	420.5	418.5	556.6	559.3
	[476.0, 694.0]	[501.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[290.0, 565.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 65: Class of 2025 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	63.9	34.2	46.4	57.9	60.6
African American	5.8	4.5	31.8	21.5	10.7	7.7
Hispanic	11.4	13.5	21.4	20.3	13.3	14.8
Asian American	16.5	15.2	8.5	8.6	15.0	14.0
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.7	3.5	2.1	2.1	1.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	42.2	34.8	80.5	18.4	49.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.5	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.4
First Generation College	2.7	7.8	6.7	9.1	3.4	8.1
Attended Private HS	23.3	22.6	20.4	19.5	22.7	22.0
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.9	26.1	25.9	22.9	25.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.2	0.9	0.4	5.7	4.3
SAT Math score	684.1	673.6	566.9	580.9	662.0	656.1
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	662.3	576.7	580.3	656.0	646.8
	[640.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	624.4	486.4	474.5	605.0	596.1
	[603.0, 714.0]	[589.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[348.0, 632.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 66: Class of 2026 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	62.8	28.3	37.2	56.6	58.3
African American	7.0	6.2	36.6	29.2	12.2	10.2
Hispanic	10.5	12.6	19.1	18.7	12.0	13.7
Asian American	15.6	15.1	11.3	10.9	14.9	14.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	1.7	4.0	3.4	2.7	2.0
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.6	0.7	0.6	1.7	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	46.5	40.3	81.3	19.5	52.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.2	9.3	9.2	9.9	9.2
First Generation College	3.2	12.4	15.7	22.4	5.4	14.1
Attended Private HS	21.8	21.2	21.3	20.7	21.7	21.2
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.0	25.2	25.3	23.1	25.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.4	0.4	0.2	4.0	2.8
SAT Math score	686.1	669.0	564.5	569.8	665.0	651.8
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	662.9	569.9	569.4	660.1	646.7
	[630.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	617.4	444.9	434.5	604.0	585.7
	[618.0, 714.0]	[565.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[310.0, 581.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

15   Combined Simulation 14 by year

Table 67: Class of 2023 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	62.8	40.3	44.1	59.5	59.2
African American	6.8	5.8	29.9	19.5	11.2	8.4
Hispanic	10.8	13.9	19.1	22.2	12.3	15.5
Asian American	14.9	13.7	5.1	6.6	13.0	12.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.5	4.4	5.0	2.6	3.0
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.3	1.2	2.5	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	53.9	45.3	87.1	21.3	60.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.5	8.1	8.1	9.5	8.4
First Generation College	2.6	12.2	11.6	15.8	4.3	12.9
Attended Private HS	25.8	23.1	20.4	22.1	24.8	22.9
% FRPL of HS	21.8	28.1	31.4	28.7	23.7	28.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	2.9	1.4	0.6	4.5	2.4
SAT Math score	715.1	703.1	584.8	577.8	690.3	679.2
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	703.5	599.6	587.1	692.5	681.3
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	593.9	421.6	404.0	551.9	557.7
	[470.0, 694.0]	[506.0, 695.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[287.0, 511.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 68: Class of 2024 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	63.9	38.2	42.3	61.2	60.2
African American	6.8	6.0	31.0	24.6	11.0	9.2
Hispanic	10.3	14.8	20.4	21.1	12.0	15.9
Asian American	13.1	12.0	6.3	8.9	11.9	11.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.4	3.5	2.4	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.0	0.5	0.7	1.0	0.9
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	47.5	38.7	81.7	17.6	53.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.6	8.3	8.1	9.4	8.5
First Generation College	2.3	11.5	13.6	22.2	4.2	13.3
Attended Private HS	23.4	20.5	22.9	22.4	23.3	20.8
% FRPL of HS	22.9	28.7	30.7	30.6	24.2	29.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.2	1.6	1.7	5.3	3.8
SAT Math score	711.0	695.9	574.6	561.7	687.6	672.9
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 600.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	700.0	588.9	572.3	690.6	678.1
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	590.5	420.5	411.4	556.6	559.7
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[288.0, 546.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 69: Class of 2025 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	61.4	34.2	44.7	57.9	58.3
African American	5.8	4.7	31.8	21.3	10.7	7.8
Hispanic	11.4	14.8	21.4	22.0	13.3	16.2
Asian American	16.5	16.2	8.5	8.9	15.0	14.8
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.7	3.5	2.2	2.1	1.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	53.8	34.8	80.5	18.4	58.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.3	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.3
First Generation College	2.7	9.7	6.7	8.5	3.4	9.4
Attended Private HS	23.3	21.4	20.4	20.3	22.7	21.2
% FRPL of HS	22.2	26.0	26.1	25.5	22.9	25.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	4.6	0.9	0.2	5.7	3.8
SAT Math score	684.1	672.4	566.9	578.4	662.0	654.7
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	659.7	576.7	579.0	656.0	644.5
	[640.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	623.6	486.4	466.8	605.0	594.0
	[603.0, 714.0]	[589.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[342.0, 624.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

54

Table 70: Class of 2026 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	60.1	28.3	34.8	56.6	55.7
African American	7.0	7.0	36.6	31.0	12.2	11.2
Hispanic	10.5	13.4	19.1	18.9	12.0	14.4
Asian American	15.6	16.6	11.3	11.6	14.9	15.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	1.3	4.0	3.3	2.7	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.5	0.7	0.4	1.7	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	57.9	40.3	81.3	19.5	61.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.0	9.3	9.2	9.9	9.1
First Generation College	3.2	15.1	15.7	23.8	5.4	16.6
Attended Private HS	21.8	20.4	21.3	21.1	21.7	20.5
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.7	25.2	25.0	23.1	25.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	2.8	0.4	0.1	4.0	2.3
SAT Math score	686.1	666.7	564.5	567.7	665.0	649.5
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	660.1	569.9	566.4	660.1	643.8
	[630.0, 730.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	616.9	444.9	421.5	604.0	583.1
	[618.0, 714.0]	[563.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[301.0, 555.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Simulations with 1.25 x Black Coefficient

Table of Contents

List of Tables

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

1   Simulations for all years together

Table 1: Pooled Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	70.9	35.1	52.1	58.0	67.4
African American	6.8	3.9	32.4	20.5	11.5	6.9
Hispanic	11.0	9.2	20.0	16.3	12.6	10.5
Asian American	15.4	12.5	7.9	6.7	14.0	11.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	1.9	3.8	3.0	2.6	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.6	0.8	1.3	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	12.8	39.7	36.8	18.8	17.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	10.0	8.7	8.8	9.8	9.8
First Generation College	2.9	2.5	11.9	11.0	4.6	4.1
Attended Private HS	23.7	24.0	21.2	21.7	23.3	23.6
% FRPL of HS	22.4	22.1	28.3	27.6	23.5	23.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.9	1.1	1.2	4.9	5.0
SAT Math score	695.6	697.3	572.5	582.3	673.1	676.2
	[640.0, 760.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	692.5	583.4	592.7	671.0	674.2
	[640.0, 740.0]	[650.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	619.0	443.7	452.3	585.0	588.5
	[574.0, 707.0]	[583.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[320.0, 624.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

Table 2: Pooled Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 1.25x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	67.3	35.1	44.8	58.0	63.2
African American	6.8	5.0	32.4	22.0	11.5	8.1
Hispanic	11.0	11.0	20.0	20.8	12.6	12.8
Asian American	15.4	13.3	7.9	8.2	14.0	12.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.1	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	26.1	39.7	68.9	18.8	34.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.8	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.5
First Generation College	2.9	7.4	11.9	26.6	4.6	10.9
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.1	21.2	19.8	23.3	22.5
% FRPL of HS	22.4	23.2	28.3	30.0	23.5	24.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.1	1.1	0.6	4.9	4.3
SAT Math score	695.6	688.6	572.5	575.0	673.1	667.8
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	684.2	583.4	580.7	671.0	665.2
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	609.0	443.7	447.2	585.0	579.4
	[574.0, 707.0]	[546.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[320.0, 616.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 1 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to 1.25 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 3: Pooled Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	66.7	35.1	44.7	58.0	62.6
African American	6.8	5.2	32.4	22.0	11.5	8.3
Hispanic	11.0	11.2	20.0	20.8	12.6	12.9
Asian American	15.4	13.5	7.9	8.4	14.0	12.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.0	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	26.8	39.7	69.4	18.8	34.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.4	8.7	8.2	9.8	9.2
First Generation College	2.9	7.5	11.9	26.4	4.6	11.0
Attended Private HS	23.7	16.1	21.2	15.5	23.3	16.0
% FRPL of HS	22.4	26.5	28.3	32.3	23.5	27.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.8	1.1	0.5	4.9	4.0
SAT Math score	695.6	686.7	572.5	574.6	673.1	666.2
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	681.8	583.4	580.3	671.0	663.2
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	609.2	443.7	449.5	585.0	580.0
	[574.0, 707.0]	[547.0, 705.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[323.0, 622.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 2 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .625 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .625 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 4: Pooled Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	66.6	35.1	44.7	58.0	62.6
African American	6.8	5.2	32.4	22.0	11.5	8.3
Hispanic	11.0	11.2	20.0	20.8	12.6	13.0
Asian American	15.4	13.5	7.9	8.4	14.0	12.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.0	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	26.8	39.7	69.4	18.8	34.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.4	8.7	8.2	9.8	9.2
First Generation College	2.9	7.6	11.9	26.4	4.6	11.0
Attended Private HS	23.7	16.0	21.2	15.5	23.3	15.9
% FRPL of HS	22.4	26.5	28.3	32.3	23.5	27.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.3	1.1	0.7	4.9	3.6
SAT Math score	695.6	686.6	572.5	574.6	673.1	666.1
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	681.7	583.4	580.3	671.0	663.2
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	609.1	443.7	449.5	585.0	579.9
	[574.0, 707.0]	[547.0, 705.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[323.0, 622.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 3 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

Table 5: Pooled Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	65.7	35.1	44.0	58.0	61.7
African American	6.8	5.2	32.4	21.5	11.5	8.2
Hispanic	11.0	11.7	20.0	21.5	12.6	13.4
Asian American	15.4	13.8	7.9	8.7	14.0	12.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.1	3.8	3.1	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.6	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	28.2	39.7	72.4	18.8	36.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.1	8.7	8.1	9.8	8.9
First Generation College	2.9	7.8	11.9	27.1	4.6	11.4
Attended Private HS	23.7	14.5	21.2	14.3	23.3	14.4
% FRPL of HS	22.4	27.4	28.3	33.1	23.5	28.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	3.0	6.5	0.7	12.2	2.6
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.3	1.1	0.8	4.9	3.7
SAT Math score	695.6	690.6	572.5	576.0	673.1	669.6
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	686.4	583.4	582.7	671.0	667.4
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	619.6	443.7	458.3	585.0	590.1
	[574.0, 707.0]	[584.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[327.0, 626.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 4 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

8

Table 6: Pooled Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	66.5	35.1	44.7	58.0	62.5
African American	6.8	5.3	32.4	22.0	11.5	8.4
Hispanic	11.0	11.8	20.0	21.0	12.6	13.5
Asian American	15.4	12.9	7.9	8.0	14.0	12.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.1	3.8	3.1	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	28.2	39.7	68.6	18.8	35.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.2	8.7	8.2	9.8	9.1
First Generation College	2.9	8.0	11.9	26.5	4.6	11.4
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.8	21.2	21.0	23.3	23.3
% FRPL of HS	22.4	24.9	28.3	30.2	23.5	25.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.8	1.1	0.5	4.9	4.0
SAT Math score	695.6	683.3	572.5	573.2	673.1	663.2
	[640.0, 760.0]	[630.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	680.1	583.4	579.4	671.0	661.7
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	607.1	443.7	447.9	585.0	578.0
	[574.0, 707.0]	[539.0, 705.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[320.0, 618.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 3 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.625 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 7: Pooled Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	66.5	35.1	45.8	58.0	62.7
African American	6.8	5.3	32.4	22.3	11.5	8.4
Hispanic	11.0	11.8	20.0	19.1	12.6	13.1
Asian American	15.4	12.9	7.9	8.6	14.0	12.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.1	3.8	3.1	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.0	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	28.2	39.7	82.6	18.8	38.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.2	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.1
First Generation College	2.9	8.0	11.9	15.5	4.6	9.4
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.8	21.2	19.2	23.3	22.9
% FRPL of HS	22.4	24.9	28.3	28.8	23.5	25.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.8	1.1	0.9	4.9	4.1
SAT Math score	695.6	683.3	572.5	580.5	673.1	664.5
	[640.0, 760.0]	[630.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	680.1	583.4	585.7	671.0	662.8
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	607.1	443.7	450.2	585.0	578.4
	[574.0, 707.0]	[539.0, 705.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[323.0, 620.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 6 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

9

Table 8: Pooled Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	65.9	35.1	51.8	58.0	60.7
African American	6.8	5.3	32.4	16.1	11.5	9.3
Hispanic	11.0	12.1	20.0	18.3	12.6	14.4
Asian American	15.4	13.1	7.9	9.9	14.0	12.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.1	3.8	2.8	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.0	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	32.0	39.7	74.7	18.8	47.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.1	8.7	8.5	9.8	8.9
First Generation College	2.9	9.4	11.9	12.9	4.6	10.7
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.7	21.2	18.4	23.3	21.8
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.6	28.3	28.6	23.5	26.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.4	6.5	3.3	12.2	9.7
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.8	1.1	1.4	4.9	3.6
SAT Math score	695.6	685.3	572.5	600.6	673.1	654.3
	[640.0, 760.0]	[630.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[540.0, 660.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	681.6	583.4	607.0	671.0	654.3
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[550.0, 670.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	612.9	443.7	465.2	585.0	558.8
	[574.0, 707.0]	[562.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[332.0, 631.0]		
N	5,642	4,378	1,264	2,528	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

Table 9: Pooled Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	61.5	35.1	38.9	58.0	57.4
African American	6.8	6.6	32.4	25.4	11.5	10.1
Hispanic	11.0	15.8	20.0	23.9	12.6	17.3
Asian American	15.4	12.0	7.9	7.2	14.0	11.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.7	3.8	3.7	2.6	2.9
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.4	0.8	0.9	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	30.9	39.7	82.6	18.8	40.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.2	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.0
First Generation College	2.9	9.3	11.9	16.9	4.6	10.7
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.6	21.2	19.6	23.3	22.9
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.5	28.3	28.9	23.5	26.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.6	1.1	0.8	4.9	3.9
SAT Math score	695.6	680.7	572.5	574.6	673.1	661.3
	[640.0, 760.0]	[630.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	677.8	583.4	580.1	671.0	659.9
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	606.9	443.7	445.5	585.0	577.3
	[574.0, 707.0]	[538.0, 705.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[318.0, 613.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 10: Pooled Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	57.3	35.1	33.8	58.0	53.0
African American	6.8	7.7	32.4	27.7	11.5	11.3
Hispanic	11.0	19.3	20.0	27.4	12.6	20.8
Asian American	15.4	11.2	7.9	6.2	14.0	10.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	3.3	3.8	4.1	2.6	3.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.2	0.8	0.8	1.3	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	33.4	39.7	82.6	18.8	42.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.1	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.0
First Generation College	2.9	10.4	11.9	17.8	4.6	11.8
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.5	21.2	20.0	23.3	22.8
% FRPL of HS	22.4	26.1	28.3	28.9	23.5	26.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.5	1.1	0.7	4.9	3.8
SAT Math score	695.6	678.5	572.5	570.4	673.1	658.7
	[640.0, 760.0]	[620.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	675.8	583.4	576.2	671.0	657.6
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	606.8	443.7	441.6	585.0	576.5
	[574.0, 707.0]	[538.0, 705.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[314.0, 610.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 11: Pooled Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	50.5	35.1	27.2	58.0	46.3
African American	6.8	9.3	32.4	30.7	11.5	13.3
Hispanic	11.0	25.0	20.0	31.9	12.6	26.3
Asian American	15.4	9.9	7.9	4.9	14.0	9.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	4.1	3.8	4.6	2.6	4.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.1	0.8	0.6	1.3	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	37.5	39.7	82.6	18.8	45.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.0	8.7	8.6	9.8	8.9
First Generation College	2.9	12.5	11.9	19.0	4.6	13.7
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.1	21.2	20.5	23.3	22.6
% FRPL of HS	22.4	27.0	28.3	28.7	23.5	27.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.2	1.1	0.5	4.9	3.5
SAT Math score	695.6	675.0	572.5	564.8	673.1	654.8
	[640.0, 760.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	672.5	583.4	571.0	671.0	653.9
	[640.0, 740.0]	[620.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	606.8	443.7	435.5	585.0	575.4
	[574.0, 707.0]	[539.0, 705.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[308.0, 599.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

11

Table 12: Pooled Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	64.3	35.1	44.0	58.0	60.6
African American	6.8	5.8	32.4	23.1	11.5	9.0
Hispanic	11.0	12.8	20.0	20.0	12.6	14.1
Asian American	15.4	13.6	7.9	8.6	14.0	12.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.1	3.8	3.2	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.4	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	38.3	39.7	82.6	18.8	46.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.1	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.0
First Generation College	2.9	10.0	11.9	16.5	4.6	11.2
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.0	21.2	20.1	23.3	22.5
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.8	28.3	28.3	23.5	26.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.3	1.1	0.8	4.9	3.7
SAT Math score	695.6	680.1	572.5	576.6	673.1	661.1
	[640.0, 760.0]	[630.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	676.8	583.4	581.7	671.0	659.4
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	605.1	443.7	442.5	585.0	575.3
	[574.0, 707.0]	[531.0, 704.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[314.0, 608.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 13: Pooled Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	62.5	35.1	42.8	58.0	58.9
African American	6.8	6.2	32.4	23.6	11.5	9.4
Hispanic	11.0	13.7	20.0	20.5	12.6	15.0
Asian American	15.4	14.2	7.9	8.8	14.0	13.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.1	3.8	3.3	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.3	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	46.4	39.7	82.6	18.8	53.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.0	8.7	8.6	9.8	8.9
First Generation College	2.9	11.7	11.9	17.0	4.6	12.7
Attended Private HS	23.7	22.3	21.2	20.7	23.3	22.0
% FRPL of HS	22.4	26.6	28.3	28.0	23.5	26.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	3.9	1.1	0.7	4.9	3.3
SAT Math score	695.6	677.9	572.5	574.2	673.1	658.9
	[640.0, 760.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	674.5	583.4	579.1	671.0	657.0
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	604.2	443.7	435.7	585.0	573.4
	[574.0, 707.0]	[524.0, 704.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[308.0, 598.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

12

Table 14: Pooled Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	59.8	35.1	41.4	58.0	56.4
African American	6.8	6.6	32.4	24.2	11.5	9.8
Hispanic	11.0	15.0	20.0	21.0	12.6	16.1
Asian American	15.4	15.3	7.9	9.1	14.0	14.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.2	3.8	3.2	2.6	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.2	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	58.0	39.7	82.6	18.8	62.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	8.8	8.7	8.7	9.8	8.8
First Generation College	2.9	14.6	11.9	17.7	4.6	15.2
Attended Private HS	23.7	21.2	21.2	21.5	23.3	21.3
% FRPL of HS	22.4	27.7	28.3	27.4	23.5	27.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	3.3	1.1	0.6	4.9	2.8
SAT Math score	695.6	675.9	572.5	571.3	673.1	656.8
	[640.0, 760.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	671.9	583.4	576.0	671.0	654.4
	[640.0, 740.0]	[620.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	604.7	443.7	426.2	585.0	572.0
	[574.0, 707.0]	[530.0, 703.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[298.0, 581.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

13

2 Combined Simulation 1 by year

Table 15: Class of 2023 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	71.5	40.3	56.3	59.5	68.6
African American	6.8	4.3	29.9	17.1	11.2	6.7
Hispanic	10.8	9.3	19.1	16.4	12.3	10.7
Asian American	14.9	11.5	5.1	4.6	13.0	10.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.7	4.4	3.9	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	14.4	45.3	41.1	21.3	19.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.8	8.1	8.1	9.5	9.5
First Generation College	2.6	2.4	11.6	11.1	4.3	4.0
Attended Private HS	25.8	26.2	20.4	21.1	24.8	25.2
% FRPL of HS	21.8	21.5	31.4	30.4	23.7	23.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	5.2	1.4	1.3	4.5	4.5
SAT Math score	715.1	715.6	584.8	593.6	690.3	692.4
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	716.1	599.6	607.3	692.5	695.4
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 790.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[560.0, 660.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	584.2	421.6	428.7	551.9	554.5
	[470.0, 694.0]	[470.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[296.0, 602.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

Table 16: Class of 2024 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	72.8	38.2	52.2	61.2	69.3
African American	6.8	4.4	31.0	20.1	11.0	7.1
Hispanic	10.3	9.0	20.4	18.1	12.0	10.6
Asian American	13.1	10.3	6.3	5.8	11.9	9.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.2	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.3	0.5	0.9	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	12.1	38.7	36.6	17.6	16.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.5	8.3	8.4	9.4	9.3
First Generation College	2.3	1.9	13.6	13.2	4.2	3.9
Attended Private HS	23.4	23.8	22.9	23.4	23.3	23.7
% FRPL of HS	22.9	22.6	30.7	29.9	24.2	23.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	6.0	1.6	2.0	5.3	5.3
SAT Math score	711.0	711.7	574.6	581.4	687.6	689.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	712.8	588.9	596.1	690.6	692.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[670.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	587.3	420.5	426.2	556.6	559.6
	[476.0, 694.0]	[484.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[297.0, 581.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

Table 17: Class of 2025 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	71.1	34.2	53.3	57.9	67.7
African American	5.8	3.1	31.8	19.6	10.7	6.2
Hispanic	11.4	9.3	21.4	16.6	13.3	10.7
Asian American	16.5	13.8	8.5	6.8	15.0	12.5
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.5	3.5	2.5	2.1	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.2	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	13.6	34.8	32.8	18.4	17.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	10.4	9.2	9.3	10.1	10.2
First Generation College	2.7	2.3	6.7	5.6	3.4	2.9
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.6	20.4	20.9	22.7	23.1
% FRPL of HS	22.2	21.9	26.1	25.3	22.9	22.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	7.0	0.9	1.0	5.7	5.8
SAT Math score	684.1	687.3	566.9	581.0	662.0	667.3
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	677.4	576.7	589.7	656.0	660.8
	[640.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	635.3	486.4	497.3	605.0	609.2
	[603.0, 714.0]	[612.0, 714.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[351.0, 663.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

Table 18: Class of 2026 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	70.2	28.3	47.1	56.6	66.2
African American	7.0	3.5	36.6	25.0	12.2	7.2
Hispanic	10.5	8.9	19.1	14.4	12.0	9.8
Asian American	15.6	13.2	11.3	9.2	14.9	12.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.1	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	2.0	0.7	1.4	1.7	1.9
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	13.8	40.3	37.0	19.5	17.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	10.0	9.3	9.3	9.9	9.9
First Generation College	3.2	2.8	15.7	13.9	5.4	4.7
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.0	21.3	21.3	21.7	21.9
% FRPL of HS	22.7	22.4	25.2	25.1	23.1	22.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.8	0.4	0.6	4.0	4.1
SAT Math score	686.1	688.4	564.5	574.2	665.0	668.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	681.0	569.9	579.2	660.1	663.3
	[630.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	639.4	444.9	455.4	604.0	607.5
	[618.0, 714.0]	[621.0, 714.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[320.0, 616.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

3   Combined Simulation 2 by year

Table 19: Class of 2023 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 1.25x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	68.2	40.3	45.4	59.5	63.9
African American	6.8	5.2	29.9	18.9	11.2	7.8
Hispanic	10.8	10.9	19.1	22.8	12.3	13.2
Asian American	14.9	12.1	5.1	6.7	13.0	11.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.9	4.4	4.5	2.6	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.8	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	27.6	45.3	72.9	21.3	36.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.6	8.1	7.7	9.5	9.2
First Generation College	2.6	7.6	11.6	29.4	4.3	11.8
Attended Private HS	25.8	25.2	20.4	17.9	24.8	23.8
% FRPL of HS	21.8	23.0	31.4	34.5	23.7	25.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.4	1.4	0.5	4.5	3.7
SAT Math score	715.1	708.0	584.8	580.4	690.3	683.7
	[660.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	708.8	599.6	591.8	692.5	686.5
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	579.3	421.6	433.4	551.9	551.5
	[470.0, 694.0]	[465.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[304.0, 621.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 15 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to 1.25 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 20: Class of 2024 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 1.25x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	69.6	38.2	45.0	61.2	65.4
African American	6.8	5.1	31.0	21.2	11.0	7.8
Hispanic	10.3	11.0	20.4	23.0	12.0	13.0
Asian American	13.1	10.8	6.3	7.3	11.9	10.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	23.9	38.7	66.1	17.6	31.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.3	8.3	8.0	9.4	9.1
First Generation College	2.3	6.7	13.6	31.6	4.2	11.0
Attended Private HS	23.4	22.8	22.9	22.5	23.3	22.7
% FRPL of HS	22.9	23.9	30.7	32.7	24.2	25.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.3	1.6	1.1	5.3	4.5
SAT Math score	711.0	704.0	574.6	573.7	687.6	681.6
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	705.7	588.9	584.4	690.6	684.9
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	581.9	420.5	424.6	556.6	554.9
	[476.0, 694.0]	[476.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[296.0, 567.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 16 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to 1.25 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 21: Class of 2025 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 1.25x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	67.7	34.2	49.1	57.9	64.2
African American	5.8	4.1	31.8	20.8	10.7	7.2
Hispanic	11.4	11.1	21.4	17.8	13.3	12.4
Asian American	16.5	14.4	8.5	9.1	15.0	13.4
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.5	3.5	2.1	2.1	1.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	26.2	34.8	65.9	18.4	33.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	10.2	9.2	9.1	10.1	10.0
First Generation College	2.7	5.8	6.7	15.9	3.4	7.7
Attended Private HS	23.3	22.9	20.4	19.2	22.7	22.2
% FRPL of HS	22.2	22.7	26.1	26.6	22.9	23.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.3	0.9	0.5	5.7	5.2
SAT Math score	684.1	678.9	566.9	579.9	662.0	660.2
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	668.8	576.7	580.5	656.0	652.1
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	625.7	486.4	485.8	605.0	599.3
	[603.0, 714.0]	[586.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 644.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 17 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to 1.25 times the coefficient on African American.

18

Table 22: Class of 2026 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 1.25x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	66.6	28.3	40.1	56.6	62.0
African American	7.0	5.0	36.6	26.6	12.2	8.7
Hispanic	10.5	10.9	19.1	19.7	12.0	12.5
Asian American	15.6	13.8	11.3	9.6	14.9	13.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.7	0.7	1.1	1.7	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	28.7	40.3	70.8	19.5	36.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.8	9.3	9.0	9.9	9.7
First Generation College	3.2	8.8	15.7	29.7	5.4	12.4
Attended Private HS	21.8	21.4	21.3	19.6	21.7	21.0
% FRPL of HS	22.7	23.1	25.2	26.6	23.1	23.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.1	0.4	0.2	4.0	3.4
SAT Math score	686.1	676.8	564.5	566.8	665.0	657.8
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	670.1	569.9	567.5	660.1	652.3
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	622.8	444.9	444.2	604.0	591.8
	[618.0, 714.0]	[584.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[318.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 18 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to 1.25 times the coefficient on African American.

19

4   Combined Simulation 3 by year

Table 23: Class of 2023 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	67.6	40.3	44.7	59.5	63.3
African American	6.8	5.4	29.9	19.0	11.2	8.0
Hispanic	10.8	11.4	19.1	23.1	12.3	13.6
Asian American	14.9	12.3	5.1	7.1	13.0	11.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.9	4.4	4.4	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	28.7	45.3	73.1	21.3	37.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.2	8.1	7.4	9.5	8.9
First Generation College	2.6	8.0	11.6	30.0	4.3	12.2
Attended Private HS	25.8	17.1	20.4	12.6	24.8	16.2
% FRPL of HS	21.8	27.2	31.4	37.3	23.7	29.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.1	1.4	0.6	4.5	3.4
SAT Math score	715.1	705.2	584.8	579.9	690.3	681.3
	[660.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	705.7	599.6	591.4	692.5	683.9
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	583.1	421.6	439.2	551.9	555.7
	[470.0, 694.0]	[470.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[312.0, 623.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 19 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .625 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .625 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 24: Class of 2024 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	69.2	38.2	44.7	61.2	65.0
African American	6.8	5.3	31.0	21.5	11.0	8.1
Hispanic	10.3	11.3	20.4	22.9	12.0	13.3
Asian American	13.1	10.7	6.3	7.3	11.9	10.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.4	3.5	2.7	2.9	2.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	24.8	38.7	66.3	17.6	31.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.0	8.3	7.7	9.4	8.8
First Generation College	2.3	7.0	13.6	30.3	4.2	11.0
Attended Private HS	23.4	14.9	22.9	16.6	23.3	15.2
% FRPL of HS	22.9	27.8	30.7	35.5	24.2	29.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.9	1.6	1.1	5.3	4.3
SAT Math score	711.0	701.1	574.6	574.2	687.6	679.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	702.4	588.9	584.7	690.6	682.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	584.7	420.5	432.0	556.6	558.5
	[476.0, 694.0]	[479.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[298.0, 591.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 20 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .625 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .625 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 25: Class of 2025 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	66.9	34.2	49.3	57.9	63.6
African American	5.8	4.2	31.8	21.0	10.7	7.4
Hispanic	11.4	11.3	21.4	17.3	13.3	12.4
Asian American	16.5	15.0	8.5	9.4	15.0	13.9
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.4	3.5	1.9	2.1	1.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	26.7	34.8	67.1	18.4	34.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.8	9.2	8.9	10.1	9.6
First Generation College	2.7	5.8	6.7	15.5	3.4	7.6
Attended Private HS	23.3	16.9	20.4	15.9	22.7	16.7
% FRPL of HS	22.2	25.2	26.1	28.6	22.9	25.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.0	0.9	0.5	5.7	5.0
SAT Math score	684.1	677.5	566.9	578.4	662.0	658.8
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	666.7	576.7	578.9	656.0	650.1
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	623.6	486.4	484.2	605.0	597.3
	[603.0, 714.0]	[583.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[350.0, 642.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 21 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .625 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .625 times the coefficient on African American.

21

Table 26: Class of 2026 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	66.1	28.3	40.3	56.6	61.6
African American	7.0	5.3	36.6	26.2	12.2	8.9
Hispanic	10.5	10.9	19.1	20.0	12.0	12.5
Asian American	15.6	13.9	11.3	9.5	14.9	13.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	1.1	1.7	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	29.0	40.3	71.1	19.5	36.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.6	9.3	8.8	9.9	9.4
First Generation College	3.2	8.8	15.7	29.7	5.4	12.5
Attended Private HS	21.8	15.4	21.3	16.7	21.7	15.6
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.7	25.2	28.1	23.1	26.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.9	0.4	0.1	4.0	3.3
SAT Math score	686.1	675.8	564.5	566.4	665.0	656.8
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	668.6	569.9	567.3	660.1	651.1
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	621.1	444.9	442.3	604.0	590.1
	[618.0, 714.0]	[581.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[318.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 22 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .625 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .625 times the coefficient on African American.

22

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

5 Combined Simulation 4 by year

Table 27: Class of 2023 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	67.7	40.3	44.7	59.5	63.3
African American	6.8	5.4	29.9	19.0	11.2	8.0
Hispanic	10.8	11.4	19.1	23.0	12.3	13.6
Asian American	14.9	12.2	5.1	7.1	13.0	11.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.8	4.4	4.4	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	28.8	45.3	73.1	21.3	37.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.2	8.1	7.5	9.5	8.9
First Generation College	2.6	8.0	11.6	29.9	4.3	12.2
Attended Private HS	25.8	17.1	20.4	12.6	24.8	16.2
% FRPL of HS	21.8	27.3	31.4	37.3	23.7	29.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.6	1.4	0.8	4.5	3.0
SAT Math score	715.1	705.2	584.8	580.0	690.3	681.3
	[660.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	705.7	599.6	591.4	692.5	683.9
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	583.3	421.6	439.2	551.9	555.8
	[470.0, 694.0]	[470.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[312.0, 623.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 23 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

Table 28: Class of 2024 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	69.2	38.2	44.8	61.2	65.0
African American	6.8	5.3	31.0	21.4	11.0	8.1
Hispanic	10.3	11.3	20.4	22.9	12.0	13.3
Asian American	13.1	10.6	6.3	7.3	11.9	10.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.4	3.5	2.7	2.9	2.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	24.8	38.7	66.2	17.6	31.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.0	8.3	7.7	9.4	8.8
First Generation College	2.3	7.0	13.6	30.3	4.2	11.0
Attended Private HS	23.4	14.9	22.9	16.6	23.3	15.2
% FRPL of HS	22.9	27.8	30.7	35.5	24.2	29.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.5	1.6	1.3	5.3	4.0
SAT Math score	711.0	701.1	574.6	574.2	687.6	679.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	702.4	588.9	584.8	690.6	682.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	584.7	420.5	431.8	556.6	558.4
	[476.0, 694.0]	[479.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[298.0, 591.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 24 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

Table 29: Class of 2025 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	66.8	34.2	49.4	57.9	63.6
African American	5.8	4.2	31.8	21.0	10.7	7.4
Hispanic	11.4	11.3	21.4	17.3	13.3	12.4
Asian American	16.5	15.0	8.5	9.4	15.0	13.9
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.5	3.5	1.9	2.1	1.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	26.8	34.8	67.1	18.4	34.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.8	9.2	8.9	10.1	9.6
First Generation College	2.7	5.8	6.7	15.5	3.4	7.6
Attended Private HS	23.3	16.8	20.4	15.9	22.7	16.6
% FRPL of HS	22.2	25.3	26.1	28.6	22.9	25.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.3	0.9	0.6	5.7	4.4
SAT Math score	684.1	677.3	566.9	578.5	662.0	658.7
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	666.6	576.7	579.0	656.0	650.0
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	623.2	486.4	484.3	605.0	597.0
	[603.0, 714.0]	[583.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[350.0, 642.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 25 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

24

Table 30: Class of 2026 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	66.0	28.3	40.3	56.6	61.6
African American	7.0	5.3	36.6	26.2	12.2	8.9
Hispanic	10.5	10.9	19.1	20.0	12.0	12.5
Asian American	15.6	14.0	11.3	9.5	14.9	13.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	1.1	1.7	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	29.0	40.3	71.1	19.5	36.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.6	9.3	8.8	9.9	9.4
First Generation College	3.2	8.9	15.7	29.7	5.4	12.5
Attended Private HS	21.8	15.4	21.3	16.7	21.7	15.6
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.6	25.2	28.1	23.1	26.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.4	0.4	0.1	4.0	2.9
SAT Math score	686.1	675.7	564.5	566.4	665.0	656.7
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	668.5	569.9	567.3	660.1	651.0
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	621.0	444.9	442.3	604.0	590.1
	[618.0, 714.0]	[581.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[318.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 26 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

6   Combined Simulation 5 by year

Table 31: Class of 2023 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	66.2	40.3	43.2	59.5	61.8
African American	6.8	5.4	29.9	18.8	11.2	8.0
Hispanic	10.8	12.0	19.1	24.6	12.3	14.4
Asian American	14.9	12.8	5.1	7.3	13.0	11.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.0	4.4	4.6	2.6	2.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	30.5	45.3	75.9	21.3	39.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.9	8.1	7.2	9.5	8.6
First Generation College	2.6	8.5	11.6	30.9	4.3	12.8
Attended Private HS	25.8	15.0	20.4	11.5	24.8	14.3
% FRPL of HS	21.8	28.4	31.4	38.7	23.7	30.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	1.8	7.6	0.5	11.8	1.5
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.9	1.4	0.9	4.5	3.3
SAT Math score	715.1	709.9	584.8	581.0	690.3	685.3
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	711.0	599.6	593.4	692.5	688.5
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	598.8	421.6	450.8	551.9	570.6
	[470.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[320.0, 629.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 27 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

Table 32: Class of 2024 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	68.4	38.2	43.8	61.2	64.1
African American	6.8	5.1	31.0	20.5	11.0	7.8
Hispanic	10.3	11.7	20.4	24.1	12.0	13.9
Asian American	13.1	11.0	6.3	7.6	11.9	10.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.5	3.5	3.0	2.9	2.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.9	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	26.4	38.7	70.5	17.6	34.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.4	8.3	7.5	9.4	8.2
First Generation College	2.3	7.3	13.6	31.8	4.2	11.5
Attended Private HS	23.4	13.6	22.9	13.7	23.3	13.6
% FRPL of HS	22.9	28.8	30.7	37.0	24.2	30.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	2.9	8.6	0.5	13.6	2.5
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.6	1.6	1.5	5.3	4.1
SAT Math score	711.0	705.8	574.6	575.2	687.6	683.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	708.1	588.9	587.3	690.6	687.4
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	601.8	420.5	445.9	556.6	575.1
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[315.0, 622.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 28 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

Table 33: Class of 2025 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	66.6	34.2	49.4	57.9	63.3
African American	5.8	4.2	31.8	20.5	10.7	7.2
Hispanic	11.4	11.4	21.4	17.2	13.3	12.5
Asian American	16.5	15.2	8.5	9.8	15.0	14.2
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.5	3.5	2.0	2.1	1.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.7	1.1	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	27.8	34.8	69.2	18.4	35.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.5	9.2	8.8	10.1	9.3
First Generation College	2.7	6.0	6.7	15.7	3.4	7.8
Attended Private HS	23.3	15.6	20.4	15.5	22.7	15.6
% FRPL of HS	22.2	25.9	26.1	28.8	22.9	26.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	3.6	5.0	1.1	11.9	3.1
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.4	0.9	0.7	5.7	4.5
SAT Math score	684.1	682.6	566.9	580.2	662.0	663.2
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	672.4	576.7	581.0	656.0	655.1
	[640.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	631.7	486.4	489.9	605.0	604.9
	[603.0, 714.0]	[608.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[356.0, 646.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 29 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

Table 34: Class of 2026 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	64.6	28.3	39.7	56.6	60.3
African American	7.0	5.7	36.6	25.8	12.2	9.2
Hispanic	10.5	11.4	19.1	20.2	12.0	12.9
Asian American	15.6	14.3	11.3	10.0	14.9	13.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.1	4.0	3.1	2.7	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.9	0.7	1.2	1.7	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	30.3	40.3	73.9	19.5	37.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.4	9.3	8.8	9.9	9.3
First Generation College	3.2	9.2	15.7	30.2	5.4	12.8
Attended Private HS	21.8	14.3	21.3	16.3	21.7	14.6
% FRPL of HS	22.7	26.3	25.2	28.3	23.1	26.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	3.4	5.1	0.7	11.0	2.9
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.6	0.4	0.1	4.0	3.0
SAT Math score	686.1	678.0	564.5	568.2	665.0	659.0
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	671.5	569.9	570.1	660.1	654.0
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	626.9	444.9	446.9	604.0	595.8
	[618.0, 714.0]	[598.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[321.0, 603.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 30 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

7 Combined Simulation 6 by year

Table 35: Class of 2023 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	67.4	40.3	45.5	59.5	63.2
African American	6.8	5.4	29.9	18.8	11.2	7.9
Hispanic	10.8	12.2	19.1	23.0	12.3	14.2
Asian American	14.9	11.6	5.1	6.3	13.0	10.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.0	4.4	4.6	2.6	2.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.8	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	30.3	45.3	73.2	21.3	38.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.0	8.1	7.4	9.5	8.7
First Generation College	2.6	8.5	11.6	29.4	4.3	12.5
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.9	20.4	19.4	24.8	23.9
% FRPL of HS	21.8	25.7	31.4	34.5	23.7	27.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.0	1.4	0.5	4.5	3.3
SAT Math score	715.1	702.2	584.8	578.8	690.3	678.6
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	704.4	599.6	590.5	692.5	682.7
	[670.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	582.7	421.6	435.0	551.9	554.6
	[470.0, 694.0]	[470.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[305.0, 622.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 23 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.625 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 36: Class of 2024 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	68.9	38.2	45.1	61.2	64.8
African American	6.8	5.4	31.0	21.2	11.0	8.1
Hispanic	10.3	11.7	20.4	23.2	12.0	13.7
Asian American	13.1	10.6	6.3	7.2	11.9	10.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.7	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	26.0	38.7	65.9	17.6	32.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.8	8.3	7.8	9.4	8.7
First Generation College	2.3	7.7	13.6	31.6	4.2	11.8
Attended Private HS	23.4	22.5	22.9	24.0	23.3	22.7
% FRPL of HS	22.9	26.1	30.7	32.6	24.2	27.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.0	1.6	1.1	5.3	4.3
SAT Math score	711.0	699.3	574.6	572.5	687.6	677.5
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	701.7	588.9	584.0	690.6	681.5
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	583.6	420.5	424.9	556.6	556.4
	[476.0, 694.0]	[484.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[296.0, 567.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 24 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.625 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 37: Class of 2025 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	66.6	34.2	48.4	57.9	63.2
African American	5.8	4.5	31.8	21.1	10.7	7.6
Hispanic	11.4	11.9	21.4	18.1	13.3	13.1
Asian American	16.5	14.0	8.5	9.0	15.0	13.1
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.8	3.5	2.2	2.1	1.9
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.2	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	27.5	34.8	64.7	18.4	34.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.6	9.2	8.9	10.1	9.5
First Generation College	2.7	6.1	6.7	15.9	3.4	7.9
Attended Private HS	23.3	24.4	20.4	20.3	22.7	23.6
% FRPL of HS	22.2	23.9	26.1	27.1	22.9	24.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.8	0.9	0.3	5.7	4.8
SAT Math score	684.1	673.8	566.9	577.1	662.0	655.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	664.6	576.7	578.1	656.0	648.3
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	623.1	486.4	486.9	605.0	597.4
	[603.0, 714.0]	[583.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[350.0, 644.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 25 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.625 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 38: Class of 2026 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	66.0	28.3	40.2	56.6	61.5
African American	7.0	5.4	36.6	26.7	12.2	9.1
Hispanic	10.5	11.4	19.1	20.0	12.0	12.9
Asian American	15.6	13.4	11.3	9.4	14.9	12.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.1	4.0	2.9	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	0.9	1.7	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	30.8	40.3	70.7	19.5	37.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.4	9.3	8.8	9.9	9.3
First Generation College	3.2	9.2	15.7	29.3	5.4	12.7
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.6	21.3	20.4	21.7	22.2
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.3	25.2	26.9	23.1	24.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.0	0.4	0.3	4.0	3.4
SAT Math score	686.1	671.5	564.5	565.3	665.0	653.1
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	666.1	569.9	566.3	660.1	648.8
	[630.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	616.8	444.9	444.3	604.0	586.9
	[618.0, 714.0]	[565.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[318.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 26 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.625 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

8 Combined Simulation 7 by year

Table 39: Class of 2023 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	67.4	40.3	44.9	59.5	63.1
African American	6.8	5.4	29.9	20.3	11.2	8.2
Hispanic	10.8	12.2	19.1	21.1	12.3	13.9
Asian American	14.9	11.6	5.1	7.2	13.0	10.8
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.0	4.4	5.1	2.6	2.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.6	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	30.3	45.3	87.1	21.3	41.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.0	8.1	7.9	9.5	8.8
First Generation College	2.6	8.5	11.6	14.3	4.3	9.6
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.9	20.4	18.5	24.8	23.7
% FRPL of HS	21.8	25.7	31.4	31.1	23.7	26.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.0	1.4	1.0	4.5	3.4
SAT Math score	715.1	702.2	584.8	582.5	690.3	679.3
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	704.4	599.6	594.7	692.5	683.5
	[670.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	582.7	421.6	429.1	551.9	553.4
	[470.0, 694.0]	[470.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[301.0, 589.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 35 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

Table 40: Class of 2024 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	68.9	38.2	45.3	61.2	64.8
African American	6.8	5.4	31.0	22.4	11.0	8.3
Hispanic	10.3	11.7	20.4	21.2	12.0	13.4
Asian American	13.1	10.6	6.3	7.8	11.9	10.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.6	2.9	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	26.0	38.7	81.7	17.6	35.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.8	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.7
First Generation College	2.3	7.7	13.6	18.4	4.2	9.5
Attended Private HS	23.4	22.5	22.9	20.6	23.3	22.1
% FRPL of HS	22.9	26.1	30.7	31.6	24.2	27.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.0	1.6	1.5	5.3	4.4
SAT Math score	711.0	699.3	574.6	578.8	687.6	678.6
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	701.7	588.9	589.0	690.6	682.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	583.6	420.5	429.2	556.6	557.1
	[476.0, 694.0]	[484.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[297.0, 570.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 36 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

Table 41: Class of 2025 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	66.6	34.2	50.4	57.9	63.6
African American	5.8	4.5	31.8	20.5	10.7	7.5
Hispanic	11.4	11.9	21.4	16.4	13.3	12.7
Asian American	16.5	14.0	8.5	9.7	15.0	13.2
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.8	3.5	2.0	2.1	1.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	0.9	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	27.5	34.8	80.5	18.4	37.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.6	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.5
First Generation College	2.7	6.1	6.7	9.1	3.4	6.7
Attended Private HS	23.3	24.4	20.4	17.6	22.7	23.1
% FRPL of HS	22.2	23.9	26.1	26.7	22.9	24.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.8	0.9	0.8	5.7	4.9
SAT Math score	684.1	673.8	566.9	587.2	662.0	657.5
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 660.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	664.6	576.7	585.1	656.0	649.6
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	623.1	486.4	487.6	605.0	597.5
	[603.0, 714.0]	[583.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[350.0, 644.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 37 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

Table 42: Class of 2026 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	66.0	28.3	42.9	56.6	62.0
African American	7.0	5.4	36.6	26.0	12.2	9.0
Hispanic	10.5	11.4	19.1	17.7	12.0	12.5
Asian American	15.6	13.4	11.3	9.7	14.9	12.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.1	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	0.8	1.7	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	30.8	40.3	81.3	19.5	39.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.4	9.3	8.9	9.9	9.3
First Generation College	3.2	9.2	15.7	20.2	5.4	11.1
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.6	21.3	19.9	21.7	22.1
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.3	25.2	26.0	23.1	24.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.0	0.4	0.4	4.0	3.4
SAT Math score	686.1	671.5	564.5	573.9	665.0	654.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	666.1	569.9	574.8	660.1	650.3
	[630.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	616.8	444.9	453.6	604.0	588.6
	[618.0, 714.0]	[565.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[323.0, 612.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 38 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

9   Combined Simulation 8 by year

Table 43: Class of 2023 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	66.8	40.3	51.1	59.5	60.8
African American	6.8	5.3	29.9	14.4	11.2	8.8
Hispanic	10.8	12.4	19.1	20.0	12.3	15.3
Asian American	14.9	11.9	5.1	10.1	13.0	11.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.1	4.4	3.5	2.6	2.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.0	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	33.5	45.3	89.2	21.3	54.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.9	8.1	8.0	9.5	8.5
First Generation College	2.6	9.7	11.6	12.5	4.3	10.8
Attended Private HS	25.8	25.4	20.4	16.1	24.8	21.8
% FRPL of HS	21.8	26.2	31.4	31.4	23.7	28.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.8	7.6	3.1	11.8	9.1
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.8	1.4	1.4	4.5	2.9
SAT Math score	715.1	704.9	584.8	612.9	690.3	669.8
	[660.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[550.0, 670.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	706.6	599.6	622.1	692.5	674.4
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[570.0, 680.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	590.7	421.6	448.2	551.9	536.4
	[470.0, 694.0]	[487.0, 695.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[323.0, 622.0]		
N	1,099	840	259	518	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

Table 44: Class of 2024 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	68.3	38.2	51.3	61.2	62.5
African American	6.8	5.3	31.0	15.4	11.0	8.8
Hispanic	10.3	12.2	20.4	20.4	12.0	15.0
Asian American	13.1	10.8	6.3	9.3	11.9	10.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.2	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	28.2	38.7	75.6	17.6	44.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.6	8.3	8.1	9.4	8.4
First Generation College	2.3	8.4	13.6	14.8	4.2	10.6
Attended Private HS	23.4	22.8	22.9	20.1	23.3	21.8
% FRPL of HS	22.9	26.8	30.7	29.8	24.2	27.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	13.9	8.6	3.8	13.6	10.4
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.9	1.6	1.9	5.3	3.9
SAT Math score	711.0	702.4	574.6	607.4	687.6	669.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[560.0, 660.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	705.2	588.9	616.0	690.6	674.6
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[560.0, 680.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	591.5	420.5	446.1	556.6	541.6
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[323.0, 597.0]		
N	1,173	930	243	486	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

Table 45: Class of 2025 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	66.1	34.2	55.2	57.9	62.0
African American	5.8	4.3	31.8	15.9	10.7	8.7
Hispanic	11.4	12.4	21.4	15.0	13.3	13.4
Asian American	16.5	14.0	8.5	10.6	15.0	12.7
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.8	3.5	2.2	2.1	2.0
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.3	0.7	1.2	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	31.8	34.8	60.5	18.4	42.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.4	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.3
First Generation College	2.7	7.2	6.7	7.4	3.4	7.3
Attended Private HS	23.3	24.1	20.4	18.0	22.7	21.8
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.5	26.1	25.9	22.9	25.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.9	5.0	2.9	11.9	9.8
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.0	0.9	1.4	5.7	4.2
SAT Math score	684.1	675.4	566.9	592.1	662.0	644.0
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 670.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	664.5	576.7	594.0	656.0	637.9
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[550.0, 670.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	626.1	486.4	509.6	605.0	582.1
	[603.0, 714.0]	[594.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[361.0, 665.0]		
N	1,105	848	257	514	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

Table 46: Class of 2026 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	65.2	28.3	49.9	56.6	59.9
African American	7.0	5.7	36.6	19.7	12.2	10.6
Hispanic	10.5	11.7	19.1	16.6	12.0	13.4
Asian American	15.6	13.6	11.3	10.0	14.9	12.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	1.9	4.0	2.5	2.7	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	1.2	1.7	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	35.8	40.3	67.1	19.5	46.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.2	9.3	8.9	9.9	9.1
First Generation College	3.2	11.3	15.7	16.6	5.4	13.2
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.2	21.3	19.7	21.7	21.3
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.0	25.2	25.8	23.1	25.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	11.6	5.1	3.1	11.0	8.7
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.1	0.4	0.8	4.0	2.9
SAT Math score	686.1	672.0	564.5	582.7	665.0	641.1
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	666.9	569.9	586.7	660.1	639.1
	[630.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	623.8	444.9	470.6	604.0	570.7
	[618.0, 714.0]	[591.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[337.0, 631.0]		
N	1,155	913	242	484	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

10 Combined Simulation 9 by year

Table 47: Class of 2023 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	62.3	40.3	38.1	59.5	57.7
African American	6.8	6.5	29.9	22.7	11.2	9.6
Hispanic	10.8	16.5	19.1	26.1	12.3	18.3
Asian American	14.9	10.7	5.1	5.9	13.0	9.8
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.6	4.4	5.7	2.6	3.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	32.8	45.3	87.2	21.3	43.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.9	8.1	7.9	9.5	8.7
First Generation College	2.6	9.6	11.6	15.6	4.3	10.8
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.7	20.4	18.9	24.8	23.6
% FRPL of HS	21.8	26.3	31.4	31.2	23.7	27.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.8	1.4	0.8	4.5	3.2
SAT Math score	715.1	700.5	584.8	577.5	690.3	677.0
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	702.8	599.6	589.9	692.5	681.2
	[670.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	584.7	421.6	424.2	551.9	554.1
	[470.0, 694.0]	[476.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[295.0, 584.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 48: Class of 2024 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	63.7	38.2	38.5	61.2	59.4
African American	6.8	6.6	31.0	25.2	11.0	9.8
Hispanic	10.3	15.7	20.4	26.0	12.0	17.5
Asian American	13.1	9.9	6.3	6.6	11.9	9.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	3.1	3.5	3.1	2.9	3.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.0	0.5	0.6	1.0	0.9
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	28.4	38.7	81.7	17.6	37.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.8	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.6
First Generation College	2.3	8.9	13.6	19.8	4.2	10.8
Attended Private HS	23.4	22.1	22.9	20.8	23.3	21.9
% FRPL of HS	22.9	26.9	30.7	32.2	24.2	27.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.8	1.6	1.5	5.3	4.2
SAT Math score	711.0	697.6	574.6	573.1	687.6	676.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	700.5	588.9	582.8	690.6	680.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	585.1	420.5	429.1	556.6	558.3
	[476.0, 694.0]	[489.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[296.0, 581.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 49: Class of 2025 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	62.1	34.2	43.8	57.9	58.6
African American	5.8	5.4	31.8	23.4	10.7	8.8
Hispanic	11.4	15.9	21.4	21.6	13.3	17.0
Asian American	16.5	13.1	8.5	7.9	15.0	12.1
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	2.3	3.5	2.5	2.1	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.7	0.8	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	30.2	34.8	80.5	18.4	39.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.5	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.5
First Generation College	2.7	7.1	6.7	10.2	3.4	7.7
Attended Private HS	23.3	24.5	20.4	18.5	22.7	23.3
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.3	26.1	26.6	22.9	24.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.7	0.9	0.6	5.7	4.7
SAT Math score	684.1	670.6	566.9	580.6	662.0	653.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	661.4	576.7	580.4	656.0	646.1
	[640.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	622.6	486.4	482.7	605.0	596.2
	[603.0, 714.0]	[579.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 638.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 50: Class of 2026 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	60.9	28.3	35.1	56.6	56.5
African American	7.0	7.1	36.6	30.1	12.2	11.1
Hispanic	10.5	15.4	19.1	22.1	12.0	16.5
Asian American	15.6	12.4	11.3	8.3	14.9	11.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.7	4.0	3.7	2.7	2.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.6	0.7	0.7	1.7	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	34.0	40.3	81.3	19.5	42.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.3	9.3	9.0	9.9	9.2
First Generation College	3.2	10.8	15.7	21.7	5.4	12.7
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.5	21.3	20.2	21.7	22.1
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.7	25.2	26.1	23.1	25.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.0	0.4	0.3	4.0	3.3
SAT Math score	686.1	667.9	564.5	567.7	665.0	650.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	662.9	569.9	568.5	660.1	646.5
	[630.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	614.2	444.9	444.9	604.0	584.9
	[618.0, 714.0]	[559.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[318.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

40

11   Combined Simulation 10 by year

Table 51: Class of 2023 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	58.0	40.3	33.5	59.5	53.4
African American	6.8	7.4	29.9	24.2	11.2	10.6
Hispanic	10.8	20.1	19.1	29.7	12.3	21.9
Asian American	14.9	10.0	5.1	5.0	13.0	9.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	3.2	4.4	6.1	2.6	3.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	34.9	45.3	87.1	21.3	44.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.8	8.1	8.0	9.5	8.7
First Generation College	2.6	10.6	11.6	16.6	4.3	11.8
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.4	20.4	19.3	24.8	23.5
% FRPL of HS	21.8	26.9	31.4	31.2	23.7	27.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.6	1.4	0.7	4.5	3.0
SAT Math score	715.1	699.1	584.8	574.0	690.3	675.3
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	701.4	599.6	586.7	692.5	679.5
	[670.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	586.5	421.6	419.5	551.9	554.6
	[470.0, 694.0]	[476.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[288.0, 572.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 52: Class of 2024 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	59.3	38.2	33.8	61.2	55.0
African American	6.8	7.7	31.0	27.3	11.0	11.0
Hispanic	10.3	19.2	20.4	29.2	12.0	20.9
Asian American	13.1	9.2	6.3	5.8	11.9	8.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	3.7	3.5	3.4	2.9	3.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	0.9	0.5	0.5	1.0	0.9
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	30.5	38.7	81.7	17.6	39.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.7	8.3	7.9	9.4	8.6
First Generation College	2.3	10.0	13.6	21.0	4.2	11.9
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.8	22.9	21.0	23.3	21.6
% FRPL of HS	22.9	27.7	30.7	32.5	24.2	28.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.6	1.6	1.4	5.3	4.1
SAT Math score	711.0	696.1	574.6	568.9	687.6	674.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	699.5	588.9	578.3	690.6	678.7
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	586.5	420.5	429.0	556.6	559.5
	[476.0, 694.0]	[494.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[292.0, 581.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 53: Class of 2025 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	58.2	34.2	38.5	57.9	54.5
African American	5.8	6.2	31.8	25.5	10.7	9.9
Hispanic	11.4	19.5	21.4	25.8	13.3	20.7
Asian American	16.5	12.3	8.5	6.6	15.0	11.2
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	2.8	3.5	2.9	2.1	2.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.7	0.7	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	32.7	34.8	80.5	18.4	41.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.5	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.4
First Generation College	2.7	8.1	6.7	11.0	3.4	8.7
Attended Private HS	23.3	24.5	20.4	19.1	22.7	23.5
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.7	26.1	26.4	22.9	25.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.5	0.9	0.5	5.7	4.6
SAT Math score	684.1	667.7	566.9	575.8	662.0	650.4
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	658.6	576.7	577.0	656.0	643.2
	[640.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	622.2	486.4	479.6	605.0	595.3
	[603.0, 714.0]	[578.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 636.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 54: Class of 2026 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	56.6	28.3	29.6	56.6	51.9
African American	7.0	8.5	36.6	33.2	12.2	12.8
Hispanic	10.5	18.8	19.1	25.2	12.0	19.9
Asian American	15.6	11.5	11.3	7.3	14.9	10.8
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	3.1	4.0	4.2	2.7	3.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.5	0.7	0.5	1.7	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	36.8	40.3	81.3	19.5	44.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.2	9.3	9.1	9.9	9.2
First Generation College	3.2	12.4	15.7	22.5	5.4	14.2
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.5	21.3	20.4	21.7	22.1
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.2	25.2	26.0	23.1	25.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.9	0.4	0.2	4.0	3.2
SAT Math score	686.1	664.7	564.5	563.4	665.0	647.2
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	660.0	569.9	563.9	660.1	643.3
	[630.0, 730.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	611.9	444.9	437.4	604.0	581.6
	[618.0, 714.0]	[555.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[314.0, 594.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

12   Combined Simulation 11 by year

Table 55: Class of 2023 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	51.3	40.3	27.6	59.5	46.8
African American	6.8	8.7	29.9	26.1	11.2	12.0
Hispanic	10.8	25.9	19.1	34.5	12.3	27.6
Asian American	14.9	8.8	5.1	3.9	13.0	7.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	4.1	4.4	6.7	2.6	4.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	38.5	45.3	87.1	21.3	47.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.7	8.1	8.1	9.5	8.6
First Generation College	2.6	12.4	11.6	18.1	4.3	13.5
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.0	20.4	20.1	24.8	23.3
% FRPL of HS	21.8	27.8	31.4	30.8	23.7	28.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.3	1.4	0.5	4.5	2.7
SAT Math score	715.1	697.2	584.8	569.5	690.3	672.8
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	699.4	599.6	582.6	692.5	677.1
	[670.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	589.7	421.6	411.1	551.9	555.7
	[470.0, 694.0]	[487.0, 695.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[287.0, 543.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 56: Class of 2024 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	52.4	38.2	27.7	61.2	48.1
African American	6.8	9.2	31.0	30.3	11.0	12.8
Hispanic	10.3	24.8	20.4	33.1	12.0	26.2
Asian American	13.1	8.1	6.3	4.7	11.9	7.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	4.7	3.5	3.8	2.9	4.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	0.8	0.5	0.4	1.0	0.8
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	34.1	38.7	81.7	17.6	42.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.6	8.3	7.9	9.4	8.5
First Generation College	2.3	12.0	13.6	22.7	4.2	13.8
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.2	22.9	21.3	23.3	21.2
% FRPL of HS	22.9	29.0	30.7	32.7	24.2	29.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.3	1.6	1.2	5.3	3.8
SAT Math score	711.0	693.7	574.6	563.1	687.6	671.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 600.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	697.8	588.9	572.2	690.6	676.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	589.0	420.5	428.7	556.6	561.5
	[476.0, 694.0]	[501.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[290.0, 597.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 57: Class of 2025 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	51.9	34.2	31.2	57.9	48.0
African American	5.8	7.4	31.8	28.2	10.7	11.3
Hispanic	11.4	25.3	21.4	31.7	13.3	26.5
Asian American	16.5	11.0	8.5	5.0	15.0	9.9
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	3.6	3.5	3.3	2.1	3.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.0	0.7	0.6	1.0	0.9
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	37.2	34.8	80.5	18.4	45.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.4	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.3
First Generation College	2.7	9.9	6.7	11.7	3.4	10.3
Attended Private HS	23.3	24.4	20.4	20.0	22.7	23.6
% FRPL of HS	22.2	25.4	26.1	26.0	22.9	25.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.2	0.9	0.3	5.7	4.3
SAT Math score	684.1	663.1	566.9	569.5	662.0	645.5
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	654.0	576.7	572.6	656.0	638.6
	[640.0, 730.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	621.4	486.4	476.5	605.0	594.1
	[603.0, 714.0]	[575.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 633.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

45

Table 58: Class of 2026 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	49.7	28.3	22.6	56.6	45.0
African American	7.0	10.8	36.6	37.7	12.2	15.5
Hispanic	10.5	24.4	19.1	28.7	12.0	25.2
Asian American	15.6	10.2	11.3	5.8	14.9	9.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	3.6	4.0	4.8	2.7	3.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.3	0.7	0.3	1.7	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	41.7	40.3	81.3	19.5	48.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.1	9.3	9.1	9.9	9.1
First Generation College	3.2	15.2	15.7	23.3	5.4	16.6
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.3	21.3	20.7	21.7	22.0
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.9	25.2	25.8	23.1	25.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.8	0.4	0.1	4.0	3.1
SAT Math score	686.1	659.3	564.5	557.8	665.0	641.7
	[640.0, 750.0]	[600.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 590.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	654.9	569.9	557.8	660.1	638.0
	[630.0, 730.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[510.0, 610.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	608.1	444.9	425.1	604.0	576.4
	[618.0, 714.0]	[548.0, 710.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[303.0, 559.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

13   Combined Simulation 12 by year

Table 59: Class of 2023 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	65.3	40.3	44.4	59.5	61.3
African American	6.8	5.7	29.9	20.1	11.2	8.5
Hispanic	10.8	13.1	19.1	21.5	12.3	14.7
Asian American	14.9	12.3	5.1	7.0	13.0	11.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.1	4.4	5.1	2.6	2.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.8	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	40.3	45.3	87.2	21.3	49.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.8	8.1	7.9	9.5	8.6
First Generation College	2.6	10.4	11.6	14.9	4.3	11.2
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.3	20.4	19.8	24.8	23.4
% FRPL of HS	21.8	26.8	31.4	30.3	23.7	27.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.5	1.4	0.8	4.5	3.0
SAT Math score	715.1	699.9	584.8	580.0	690.3	677.1
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	702.1	599.6	591.5	692.5	681.0
	[670.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	584.4	421.6	421.4	551.9	553.3
	[470.0, 694.0]	[476.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[290.0, 567.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 60: Class of 2024 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	66.8	38.2	44.2	61.2	62.9
African American	6.8	5.8	31.0	22.9	11.0	8.7
Hispanic	10.3	13.0	20.4	21.4	12.0	14.4
Asian American	13.1	11.1	6.3	8.2	11.9	10.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.6	2.9	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.0	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	34.9	38.7	81.7	17.6	42.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.7	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.6
First Generation College	2.3	9.6	13.6	20.0	4.2	11.4
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.8	22.9	21.2	23.3	21.7
% FRPL of HS	22.9	27.2	30.7	31.4	24.2	27.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.6	1.6	1.6	5.3	4.1
SAT Math score	711.0	695.9	574.6	572.0	687.6	674.6
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	699.0	588.9	582.3	690.6	679.0
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	583.2	420.5	423.8	556.6	555.9
	[476.0, 694.0]	[484.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[292.0, 567.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 61: Class of 2025 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	64.5	34.2	48.1	57.9	61.4
African American	5.8	4.8	31.8	21.2	10.7	7.9
Hispanic	11.4	13.1	21.4	18.9	13.3	14.1
Asian American	16.5	14.6	8.5	8.8	15.0	13.5
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.8	3.5	2.1	2.1	1.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	37.6	34.8	80.5	18.4	45.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.5	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.4
First Generation College	2.7	7.4	6.7	9.3	3.4	7.7
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.5	20.4	18.8	22.7	22.6
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.6	26.1	26.3	22.9	24.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.3	0.9	0.6	5.7	4.4
SAT Math score	684.1	671.1	566.9	583.4	662.0	654.5
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	661.0	576.7	582.3	656.0	646.2
	[640.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	620.9	486.4	480.2	605.0	594.4
	[603.0, 714.0]	[575.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[348.0, 636.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 62: Class of 2026 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	63.6	28.3	39.4	56.6	59.4
African American	7.0	6.2	36.6	27.9	12.2	9.9
Hispanic	10.5	12.5	19.1	18.4	12.0	13.5
Asian American	15.6	14.2	11.3	10.3	14.9	13.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	1.9	4.0	3.3	2.7	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.7	0.7	0.7	1.7	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	42.2	40.3	81.3	19.5	48.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.2	9.3	9.1	9.9	9.2
First Generation College	3.2	11.8	15.7	21.5	5.4	13.5
Attended Private HS	21.8	21.9	21.3	20.4	21.7	21.6
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.9	25.2	25.6	23.1	25.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.5	0.4	0.2	4.0	3.0
SAT Math score	686.1	666.7	564.5	571.2	665.0	650.1
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	661.4	569.9	571.4	660.1	645.8
	[630.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	611.9	444.9	443.5	604.0	582.7
	[618.0, 714.0]	[555.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[315.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

14   Combined Simulation 13 by year

Table 63: Class of 2023 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	63.7	40.3	44.3	59.5	60.0
African American	6.8	5.9	29.9	19.9	11.2	8.6
Hispanic	10.8	13.8	19.1	21.8	12.3	15.3
Asian American	14.9	12.9	5.1	6.9	13.0	11.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.3	4.4	5.1	2.6	2.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.4	1.2	2.1	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	48.0	45.3	87.1	21.3	55.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.6	8.1	8.0	9.5	8.5
First Generation College	2.6	12.0	11.6	15.3	4.3	12.6
Attended Private HS	25.8	23.7	20.4	20.8	24.8	23.1
% FRPL of HS	21.8	27.8	31.4	29.7	23.7	28.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.1	1.4	0.7	4.5	2.7
SAT Math score	715.1	698.8	584.8	578.9	690.3	675.9
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	700.5	599.6	589.6	692.5	679.4
	[670.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	586.3	421.6	414.2	551.9	553.5
	[470.0, 694.0]	[479.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[288.0, 543.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 64: Class of 2024 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	65.1	38.2	43.5	61.2	61.4
African American	6.8	6.1	31.0	23.5	11.0	9.1
Hispanic	10.3	14.1	20.4	21.3	12.0	15.3
Asian American	13.1	11.4	6.3	8.5	11.9	10.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.5	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.0	0.5	0.7	1.0	0.9
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	42.0	38.7	81.7	17.6	48.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.6	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.5
First Generation College	2.3	11.3	13.6	21.1	4.2	13.0
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.3	22.9	21.8	23.3	21.4
% FRPL of HS	22.9	28.1	30.7	31.2	24.2	28.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.3	1.6	1.7	5.3	3.8
SAT Math score	711.0	693.3	574.6	567.5	687.6	671.7
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	697.1	588.9	577.9	690.6	676.6
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	583.4	420.5	418.5	556.6	555.1
	[476.0, 694.0]	[484.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[290.0, 565.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 65: Class of 2025 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	62.7	34.2	46.4	57.9	59.6
African American	5.8	5.0	31.8	21.5	10.7	8.1
Hispanic	11.4	14.1	21.4	20.3	13.3	15.3
Asian American	16.5	15.2	8.5	8.6	15.0	14.0
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.8	3.5	2.1	2.1	1.9
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	46.0	34.8	80.5	18.4	52.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.4	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.4
First Generation College	2.7	8.6	6.7	9.1	3.4	8.7
Attended Private HS	23.3	22.7	20.4	19.5	22.7	22.1
% FRPL of HS	22.2	25.3	26.1	25.9	22.9	25.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	4.9	0.9	0.4	5.7	4.1
SAT Math score	684.1	669.3	566.9	580.9	662.0	652.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	658.4	576.7	580.3	656.0	643.7
	[640.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	619.7	486.4	474.5	605.0	592.3
	[603.0, 714.0]	[572.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[348.0, 632.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 66: Class of 2026 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	61.5	28.3	37.2	56.6	57.3
African American	7.0	6.8	36.6	29.2	12.2	10.7
Hispanic	10.5	13.4	19.1	18.7	12.0	14.3
Asian American	15.6	15.0	11.3	10.9	14.9	14.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	1.7	4.0	3.4	2.7	2.0
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.6	0.7	0.6	1.7	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	51.2	40.3	81.3	19.5	56.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.1	9.3	9.2	9.9	9.1
First Generation College	3.2	14.2	15.7	22.4	5.4	15.6
Attended Private HS	21.8	21.3	21.3	20.7	21.7	21.2
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.4	25.2	25.3	23.1	25.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.1	0.4	0.2	4.0	2.6
SAT Math score	686.1	663.3	564.5	569.8	665.0	647.1
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	657.9	569.9	569.4	660.1	642.5
	[630.0, 730.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	609.0	444.9	434.5	604.0	578.8
	[618.0, 714.0]	[548.0, 710.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[310.0, 581.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

15 Combined Simulation 14 by year

Table 67: Class of 2023 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	61.5	40.3	44.1	59.5	58.2
African American	6.8	6.1	29.9	19.5	11.2	8.6
Hispanic	10.8	14.8	19.1	22.2	12.3	16.2
Asian American	14.9	13.8	5.1	6.6	13.0	12.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.5	4.4	5.0	2.6	3.0
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.3	1.2	2.5	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	58.8	45.3	87.1	21.3	64.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.4	8.1	8.1	9.5	8.3
First Generation College	2.6	14.4	11.6	15.8	4.3	14.7
Attended Private HS	25.8	22.9	20.4	22.1	24.8	22.7
% FRPL of HS	21.8	29.1	31.4	28.7	23.7	29.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	2.6	1.4	0.6	4.5	2.2
SAT Math score	715.1	698.4	584.8	577.8	690.3	675.4
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	699.1	599.6	587.1	692.5	677.7
	[670.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	590.5	421.6	404.0	551.9	555.0
	[470.0, 694.0]	[494.0, 695.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[287.0, 511.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 68: Class of 2024 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	62.5	38.2	42.3	61.2	59.1
African American	6.8	6.4	31.0	24.6	11.0	9.6
Hispanic	10.3	15.7	20.4	21.1	12.0	16.6
Asian American	13.1	12.0	6.3	8.9	11.9	11.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.4	3.5	2.4	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	0.9	0.5	0.7	1.0	0.9
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	52.5	38.7	81.7	17.6	57.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.4	8.3	8.1	9.4	8.4
First Generation College	2.3	13.9	13.6	22.2	4.2	15.3
Attended Private HS	23.4	20.5	22.9	22.4	23.3	20.8
% FRPL of HS	22.9	29.5	30.7	30.6	24.2	29.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	3.9	1.6	1.7	5.3	3.5
SAT Math score	711.0	690.2	574.6	561.7	687.6	668.1
	[660.0, 770.0]	[630.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 600.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	694.9	588.9	572.3	690.6	673.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	585.0	420.5	411.4	556.6	555.2
	[476.0, 694.0]	[494.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[288.0, 546.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 69: Class of 2025 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	59.8	34.2	44.7	57.9	57.0
African American	5.8	5.2	31.8	21.3	10.7	8.2
Hispanic	11.4	15.7	21.4	22.0	13.3	16.9
Asian American	16.5	16.3	8.5	8.9	15.0	14.9
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.8	3.5	2.2	2.1	1.9
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	58.4	34.8	80.5	18.4	62.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.2	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.2
First Generation College	2.7	10.8	6.7	8.5	3.4	10.3
Attended Private HS	23.3	21.2	20.4	20.3	22.7	21.1
% FRPL of HS	22.2	26.3	26.1	25.5	22.9	26.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	4.2	0.9	0.2	5.7	3.4
SAT Math score	684.1	667.7	566.9	578.4	662.0	650.9
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	655.4	576.7	579.0	656.0	641.0
	[640.0, 730.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	619.0	486.4	466.8	605.0	590.3
	[603.0, 714.0]	[572.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[342.0, 624.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 70: Class of 2026 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	58.4	28.3	34.8	56.6	54.3
African American	7.0	7.7	36.6	31.0	12.2	11.8
Hispanic	10.5	14.5	19.1	18.9	12.0	15.3
Asian American	15.6	16.6	11.3	11.6	14.9	15.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	1.3	4.0	3.3	2.7	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.5	0.7	0.4	1.7	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	63.3	40.3	81.3	19.5	66.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	8.9	9.3	9.2	9.9	9.0
First Generation College	3.2	17.8	15.7	23.8	5.4	18.8
Attended Private HS	21.8	20.3	21.3	21.1	21.7	20.4
% FRPL of HS	22.7	26.1	25.2	25.0	23.1	25.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	2.5	0.4	0.1	4.0	2.1
SAT Math score	686.1	660.1	564.5	567.7	665.0	644.1
	[640.0, 750.0]	[600.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	653.9	569.9	566.4	660.1	638.7
	[630.0, 730.0]	[610.0, 710.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	607.2	444.9	421.5	604.0	575.0
	[618.0, 714.0]	[547.0, 709.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[301.0, 555.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Simulations with 1.5 x Black Coefficient

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Table of Contents

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

List of Tables

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

1   Simulations for all years together

Table 1: Pooled Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	70.9	35.1	52.1	58.0	67.4
African American	6.8	3.9	32.4	20.5	11.5	6.9
Hispanic	11.0	9.2	20.0	16.3	12.6	10.5
Asian American	15.4	12.5	7.9	6.7	14.0	11.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	1.9	3.8	3.0	2.6	2.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.6	0.8	1.3	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	12.8	39.7	36.8	18.8	17.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	10.0	8.7	8.8	9.8	9.8
First Generation College	2.9	2.5	11.9	11.0	4.6	4.1
Attended Private HS	23.7	24.0	21.2	21.7	23.3	23.6
% FRPL of HS	22.4	22.1	28.3	27.6	23.5	23.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.9	1.1	1.2	4.9	5.0
SAT Math score	695.6	697.3	572.5	582.3	673.1	676.2
	[640.0, 760.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	692.5	583.4	592.7	671.0	674.2
	[640.0, 740.0]	[650.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	619.0	443.7	452.3	585.0	588.5
	[574.0, 707.0]	[583.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[320.0, 624.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

Table 2: Pooled Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 1.50x Boost for Low SES Family

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	66.6	35.1	44.4	58.0	62.6
African American	6.8	5.2	32.4	22.0	11.5	8.3
Hispanic	11.0	11.3	20.0	21.0	12.6	13.1
Asian American	15.4	13.3	7.9	8.4	14.0	12.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.1	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	28.4	39.7	72.0	18.8	36.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.7	8.7	8.4	9.8	9.5
First Generation College	2.9	8.1	11.9	28.0	4.6	11.7
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.0	21.2	19.6	23.3	22.4
% FRPL of HS	22.4	23.5	28.3	30.2	23.5	24.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	5.0	1.1	0.5	4.9	4.2
SAT Math score	695.6	686.2	572.5	575.2	673.1	665.9
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	682.0	583.4	580.2	671.0	663.4
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	605.5	443.7	447.5	585.0	576.6
	[574.0, 707.0]	[531.0, 705.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[320.0, 616.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 1 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to 1.5 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 3: Pooled Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	66.0	35.1	44.2	58.0	62.0
African American	6.8	5.5	32.4	22.1	11.5	8.5
Hispanic	11.0	11.5	20.0	21.1	12.6	13.2
Asian American	15.4	13.5	7.9	8.6	14.0	12.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.0	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	29.0	39.7	72.4	18.8	37.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.4	8.7	8.2	9.8	9.1
First Generation College	2.9	8.2	11.9	27.6	4.6	11.7
Attended Private HS	23.7	15.1	21.2	15.1	23.3	15.1
% FRPL of HS	22.4	27.2	28.3	32.8	23.5	28.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.6	1.1	0.5	4.9	3.9
SAT Math score	695.6	684.0	572.5	574.6	673.1	664.0
	[640.0, 760.0]	[630.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	679.3	583.4	579.7	671.0	661.1
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	605.5	443.7	450.0	585.0	577.1
	[574.0, 707.0]	[535.0, 704.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[323.0, 622.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 2 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .75 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .75 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 4: Pooled Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	66.0	35.1	44.2	58.0	62.0
African American	6.8	5.5	32.4	22.0	11.5	8.5
Hispanic	11.0	11.5	20.0	21.1	12.6	13.3
Asian American	15.4	13.6	7.9	8.6	14.0	12.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.0	3.8	3.0	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	29.1	39.7	72.4	18.8	37.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.3	8.7	8.2	9.8	9.1
First Generation College	2.9	8.2	11.9	27.6	4.6	11.7
Attended Private HS	23.7	15.0	21.2	15.1	23.3	15.0
% FRPL of HS	22.4	27.2	28.3	32.8	23.5	28.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.1	1.1	0.6	4.9	3.5
SAT Math score	695.6	683.9	572.5	574.6	673.1	663.9
	[640.0, 760.0]	[630.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	679.2	583.4	579.7	671.0	661.0
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	605.4	443.7	450.0	585.0	577.0
	[574.0, 707.0]	[533.0, 704.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[323.0, 622.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 3 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

Table 5: Pooled Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	65.0	35.1	43.4	58.0	61.0
African American	6.8	5.5	32.4	21.6	11.5	8.5
Hispanic	11.0	12.0	20.0	21.7	12.6	13.8
Asian American	15.4	13.9	7.9	9.0	14.0	13.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.1	3.8	3.1	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.6	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	30.4	39.7	75.8	18.8	38.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.0	8.7	8.1	9.8	8.8
First Generation College	2.9	8.4	11.9	28.3	4.6	12.1
Attended Private HS	23.7	13.3	21.2	13.8	23.3	13.4
% FRPL of HS	22.4	28.1	28.3	33.6	23.5	29.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	2.9	6.5	0.7	12.2	2.5
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.2	1.1	0.7	4.9	3.5
SAT Math score	695.6	687.8	572.5	576.0	673.1	667.3
	[640.0, 760.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	683.8	583.4	582.0	671.0	665.2
	[640.0, 740.0]	[640.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	615.7	443.7	458.8	585.0	587.0
	[574.0, 707.0]	[570.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[328.0, 626.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 4 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

Table 6: Pooled Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	65.9	35.1	44.2	58.0	61.9
African American	6.8	5.6	32.4	22.1	11.5	8.6
Hispanic	11.0	12.1	20.0	21.4	12.6	13.8
Asian American	15.4	12.9	7.9	8.2	14.0	12.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.1	3.8	3.1	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	30.5	39.7	71.5	18.8	38.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.2	8.7	8.2	9.8	9.0
First Generation College	2.9	8.6	11.9	27.8	4.6	12.1
Attended Private HS	23.7	24.0	21.2	20.9	23.3	23.5
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.2	28.3	30.6	23.5	26.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.7	1.1	0.5	4.9	3.9
SAT Math score	695.6	680.3	572.5	573.1	673.1	660.6
	[640.0, 760.0]	[630.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	677.5	583.4	578.7	671.0	659.4
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	603.0	443.7	448.7	585.0	574.8
	[574.0, 707.0]	[520.0, 704.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[321.0, 620.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 3 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.75 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 7: Pooled Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	65.9	35.1	45.8	58.0	62.2
African American	6.8	5.6	32.4	22.3	11.5	8.7
Hispanic	11.0	12.1	20.0	19.1	12.6	13.4
Asian American	15.4	12.9	7.9	8.6	14.0	12.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.1	3.8	3.1	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.0	1.3	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	30.5	39.7	82.6	18.8	40.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.2	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.0
First Generation College	2.9	8.6	11.9	15.5	4.6	9.9
Attended Private HS	23.7	24.0	21.2	19.2	23.3	23.1
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.2	28.3	28.8	23.5	25.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.7	1.1	0.9	4.9	4.0
SAT Math score	695.6	680.3	572.5	580.5	673.1	662.0
	[640.0, 760.0]	[630.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	677.5	583.4	585.7	671.0	660.7
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	603.0	443.7	450.2	585.0	575.1
	[574.0, 707.0]	[520.0, 704.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[323.0, 620.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 6 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

Table 8: Pooled Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	65.0	35.1	51.8	58.0	60.2
African American	6.8	5.7	32.4	16.1	11.5	9.5
Hispanic	11.0	12.6	20.0	18.3	12.6	14.7
Asian American	15.4	13.1	7.9	9.9	14.0	12.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.1	3.8	2.8	2.6	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.5	0.8	1.0	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	35.2	39.7	74.7	18.8	49.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.0	8.7	8.5	9.8	8.8
First Generation College	2.9	10.4	11.9	12.9	4.6	11.3
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.9	21.2	18.4	23.3	21.8
% FRPL of HS	22.4	26.0	28.3	28.6	23.5	26.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.4	6.5	3.3	12.2	9.7
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.6	1.1	1.4	4.9	3.4
SAT Math score	695.6	681.3	572.5	600.6	673.1	651.7
	[640.0, 760.0]	[630.0, 750.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[540.0, 660.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	678.1	583.4	607.0	671.0	652.1
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[550.0, 670.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	607.9	443.7	465.2	585.0	555.7
	[574.0, 707.0]	[543.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[332.0, 631.0]		
N	5,642	4,378	1,264	2,528	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

Table 9: Pooled Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	60.7	35.1	38.9	58.0	56.7
African American	6.8	7.0	32.4	25.4	11.5	10.4
Hispanic	11.0	16.3	20.0	23.9	12.6	17.7
Asian American	15.4	11.9	7.9	7.2	14.0	11.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.8	3.8	3.7	2.6	2.9
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.3	0.8	0.9	1.3	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	33.7	39.7	82.6	18.8	42.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.1	8.7	8.5	9.8	9.0
First Generation College	2.9	10.1	11.9	16.9	4.6	11.3
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.8	21.2	19.6	23.3	23.0
% FRPL of HS	22.4	25.9	28.3	28.9	23.5	26.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.4	1.1	0.8	4.9	3.8
SAT Math score	695.6	677.1	572.5	574.6	673.1	658.3
	[640.0, 760.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	674.7	583.4	580.1	671.0	657.4
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	602.2	443.7	445.5	585.0	573.5
	[574.0, 707.0]	[516.0, 703.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[318.0, 613.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 10: Pooled Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	56.2	35.1	33.8	58.0	52.1
African American	6.8	8.2	32.4	27.7	11.5	11.8
Hispanic	11.0	19.9	20.0	27.4	12.6	21.3
Asian American	15.4	11.1	7.9	6.2	14.0	10.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	3.3	3.8	4.1	2.6	3.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.2	0.8	0.8	1.3	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	36.5	39.7	82.6	18.8	44.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.0	8.7	8.5	9.8	8.9
First Generation College	2.9	11.4	11.9	17.8	4.6	12.6
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.6	21.2	20.0	23.3	22.9
% FRPL of HS	22.4	26.5	28.3	28.9	23.5	26.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.2	1.1	0.7	4.9	3.6
SAT Math score	695.6	674.3	572.5	570.4	673.1	655.3
	[640.0, 760.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	672.2	583.4	576.2	671.0	654.6
	[640.0, 740.0]	[620.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	601.6	443.7	441.6	585.0	572.3
	[574.0, 707.0]	[515.0, 703.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[314.0, 610.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 11: Pooled Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	49.2	35.1	27.2	58.0	45.2
African American	6.8	10.0	32.4	30.7	11.5	13.8
Hispanic	11.0	25.7	20.0	31.9	12.6	26.9
Asian American	15.4	9.8	7.9	4.9	14.0	8.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	4.2	3.8	4.6	2.6	4.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.0	0.8	0.6	1.3	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	41.4	39.7	82.6	18.8	48.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	8.9	8.7	8.6	9.8	8.9
First Generation College	2.9	13.9	11.9	19.0	4.6	14.9
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.1	21.2	20.5	23.3	22.6
% FRPL of HS	22.4	27.4	28.3	28.7	23.5	27.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	3.9	1.1	0.5	4.9	3.3
SAT Math score	695.6	669.8	572.5	564.8	673.1	650.6
	[640.0, 760.0]	[610.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	668.0	583.4	571.0	671.0	650.3
	[640.0, 740.0]	[620.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	600.8	443.7	435.5	585.0	570.5
	[574.0, 707.0]	[511.0, 703.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[308.0, 599.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

11

Table 12: Pooled Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	63.4	35.1	44.0	58.0	59.9
African American	6.8	6.2	32.4	23.1	11.5	9.3
Hispanic	11.0	13.3	20.0	20.0	12.6	14.5
Asian American	15.4	13.6	7.9	8.6	14.0	12.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.1	3.8	3.2	2.6	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.4	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	41.6	39.7	82.6	18.8	49.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.0	8.7	8.5	9.8	8.9
First Generation College	2.9	10.8	11.9	16.5	4.6	11.9
Attended Private HS	23.7	23.1	21.2	20.1	23.3	22.6
% FRPL of HS	22.4	26.2	28.3	28.3	23.5	26.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	4.1	1.1	0.8	4.9	3.5
SAT Math score	695.6	676.1	572.5	576.6	673.1	657.9
	[640.0, 760.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	673.4	583.4	581.7	671.0	656.6
	[640.0, 740.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	599.9	443.7	442.5	585.0	571.1
	[574.0, 707.0]	[511.0, 703.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[314.0, 608.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 13: Pooled Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	61.4	35.1	42.8	58.0	58.0
African American	6.8	6.6	32.4	23.6	11.5	9.7
Hispanic	11.0	14.3	20.0	20.5	12.6	15.4
Asian American	15.4	14.2	7.9	8.8	14.0	13.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.2	3.8	3.3	2.6	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.3	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	50.4	39.7	82.6	18.8	56.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	8.9	8.7	8.6	9.8	8.8
First Generation College	2.9	12.9	11.9	17.0	4.6	13.6
Attended Private HS	23.7	22.3	21.2	20.7	23.3	22.0
% FRPL of HS	22.4	27.0	28.3	28.0	23.5	27.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	3.6	1.1	0.7	4.9	3.1
SAT Math score	695.6	673.3	572.5	574.2	673.1	655.2
	[640.0, 760.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	670.4	583.4	579.1	671.0	653.7
	[640.0, 740.0]	[620.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	598.4	443.7	435.7	585.0	568.6
	[574.0, 707.0]	[511.0, 703.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[308.0, 598.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Table 14: Pooled Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.2	58.5	35.1	41.4	58.0	55.3
African American	6.8	7.1	32.4	24.2	11.5	10.2
Hispanic	11.0	15.8	20.0	21.0	12.6	16.7
Asian American	15.4	15.3	7.9	9.1	14.0	14.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.3	2.2	3.8	3.2	2.6	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.4	1.1	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.1	62.5	39.7	82.6	18.8	66.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	8.7	8.7	8.7	9.8	8.7
First Generation College	2.9	16.3	11.9	17.7	4.6	16.5
Attended Private HS	23.7	21.1	21.2	21.5	23.3	21.2
% FRPL of HS	22.4	28.2	28.3	27.4	23.5	28.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.4	13.5	6.5	6.5	12.2	12.2
USNA Legacy	5.8	3.0	1.1	0.6	4.9	2.5
SAT Math score	695.6	670.7	572.5	571.3	673.1	652.5
	[640.0, 760.0]	[610.0, 740.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	690.6	667.3	583.4	576.0	671.0	650.5
	[640.0, 740.0]	[620.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	616.6	598.5	443.7	426.2	585.0	567.0
	[574.0, 707.0]	[511.0, 703.0]	[314.0, 613.0]	[298.0, 581.0]		
N	5,642	5,642	1,264	1,264	6,906	6,906

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 7 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

13

2   Combined Simulation 1 by year

Table 15: Class of 2023 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	71.5	40.3	56.3	59.5	68.6
African American	6.8	4.3	29.9	17.1	11.2	6.7
Hispanic	10.8	9.3	19.1	16.4	12.3	10.7
Asian American	14.9	11.5	5.1	4.6	13.0	10.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.7	4.4	3.9	2.6	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	14.4	45.3	41.1	21.3	19.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.8	8.1	8.1	9.5	9.5
First Generation College	2.6	2.4	11.6	11.1	4.3	4.0
Attended Private HS	25.8	26.2	20.4	21.1	24.8	25.2
% FRPL of HS	21.8	21.5	31.4	30.4	23.7	23.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	5.2	1.4	1.3	4.5	4.5
SAT Math score	715.1	715.6	584.8	593.6	690.3	692.4
	[660.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	716.1	599.6	607.3	692.5	695.4
	[670.0, 780.0]	[670.0, 790.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[560.0, 660.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	584.2	421.6	428.7	551.9	554.5
	[470.0, 694.0]	[470.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[296.0, 602.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

Table 16: Class of 2024 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	72.8	38.2	52.2	61.2	69.3
African American	6.8	4.4	31.0	20.1	11.0	7.1
Hispanic	10.3	9.0	20.4	18.1	12.0	10.6
Asian American	13.1	10.3	6.3	5.8	11.9	9.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.2	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.3	0.5	0.9	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	12.1	38.7	36.6	17.6	16.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.5	8.3	8.4	9.4	9.3
First Generation College	2.3	1.9	13.6	13.2	4.2	3.9
Attended Private HS	23.4	23.8	22.9	23.4	23.3	23.7
% FRPL of HS	22.9	22.6	30.7	29.9	24.2	23.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	6.0	1.6	2.0	5.3	5.3
SAT Math score	711.0	711.7	574.6	581.4	687.6	689.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	712.8	588.9	596.1	690.6	692.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[670.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	587.3	420.5	426.2	556.6	559.6
	[476.0, 694.0]	[484.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[297.0, 581.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

Table 17: Class of 2025 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	71.1	34.2	53.3	57.9	67.7
African American	5.8	3.1	31.8	19.6	10.7	6.2
Hispanic	11.4	9.3	21.4	16.6	13.3	10.7
Asian American	16.5	13.8	8.5	6.8	15.0	12.5
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.5	3.5	2.5	2.1	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.2	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	13.6	34.8	32.8	18.4	17.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	10.4	9.2	9.3	10.1	10.2
First Generation College	2.7	2.3	6.7	5.6	3.4	2.9
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.6	20.4	20.9	22.7	23.1
% FRPL of HS	22.2	21.9	26.1	25.3	22.9	22.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	7.0	0.9	1.0	5.7	5.8
SAT Math score	684.1	687.3	566.9	581.0	662.0	667.3
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	677.4	576.7	589.7	656.0	660.8
	[640.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	635.3	486.4	497.3	605.0	609.2
	[603.0, 714.0]	[612.0, 714.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[351.0, 663.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Table 18: Class of 2026 Simulation 1—Eliminate Racial Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	70.2	28.3	47.1	56.6	66.2
African American	7.0	3.5	36.6	25.0	12.2	7.2
Hispanic	10.5	8.9	19.1	14.4	12.0	9.8
Asian American	15.6	13.2	11.3	9.2	14.9	12.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.1	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	2.0	0.7	1.4	1.7	1.9
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	13.8	40.3	37.0	19.5	17.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	10.0	9.3	9.3	9.9	9.9
First Generation College	3.2	2.8	15.7	13.9	5.4	4.7
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.0	21.3	21.3	21.7	21.9
% FRPL of HS	22.7	22.4	25.2	25.1	23.1	22.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.8	0.4	0.6	4.0	4.1
SAT Math score	686.1	688.4	564.5	574.2	665.0	668.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	681.0	569.9	579.2	660.1	663.3
	[630.0, 730.0]	[640.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	639.4	444.9	455.4	604.0	607.5
	[618.0, 714.0]	[621.0, 714.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[320.0, 616.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation uses Arcidiacono's preferred pre- and post-period Models 5 and sets all race coefficients and interactions to zero, then adjusts the resulting predicted admissions probabilities so that the total number of admits is constant. The simulation treats Blue Chip Athlete admissions as fixed since the estimated models exclude these applicants.

3   Combined Simulation 2 by year

Table 19: Class of 2023 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 1.50x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	67.5	40.3	44.3	59.5	63.1
African American	6.8	5.4	29.9	19.0	11.2	8.0
Hispanic	10.8	11.4	19.1	23.3	12.3	13.6
Asian American	14.9	12.2	5.1	6.9	13.0	11.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.9	4.4	4.6	2.6	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.8	1.3	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	30.4	45.3	76.2	21.3	39.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.5	8.1	7.7	9.5	9.2
First Generation College	2.6	8.5	11.6	31.7	4.3	13.0
Attended Private HS	25.8	25.0	20.4	17.5	24.8	23.6
% FRPL of HS	21.8	23.4	31.4	34.8	23.7	25.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	4.2	1.4	0.5	4.5	3.5
SAT Math score	715.1	705.5	584.8	579.9	690.3	681.6
	[660.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	706.5	599.6	590.7	692.5	684.4
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	576.6	421.6	433.9	551.9	549.4
	[470.0, 694.0]	[465.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[305.0, 621.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 15 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to 1.5 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 20: Class of 2024 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 1.50x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	69.0	38.2	44.2	61.2	64.7
African American	6.8	5.3	31.0	21.3	11.0	8.0
Hispanic	10.3	11.4	20.4	23.5	12.0	13.4
Asian American	13.1	10.9	6.3	7.5	11.9	10.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.9	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	26.3	38.7	69.4	17.6	33.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	9.2	8.3	8.0	9.4	9.0
First Generation College	2.3	7.7	13.6	33.7	4.2	12.1
Attended Private HS	23.4	22.6	22.9	22.4	23.3	22.6
% FRPL of HS	22.9	24.2	30.7	32.9	24.2	25.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	5.1	1.6	1.0	5.3	4.4
SAT Math score	711.0	701.5	574.6	573.6	687.6	679.6
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	703.4	588.9	583.6	690.6	682.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	579.0	420.5	425.0	556.6	552.5
	[476.0, 694.0]	[470.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[296.0, 567.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 16 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to 1.5 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 21: Class of 2025 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 1.50x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	67.2	34.2	49.0	57.9	63.7
African American	5.8	4.4	31.8	20.8	10.7	7.5
Hispanic	11.4	11.3	21.4	17.7	13.3	12.5
Asian American	16.5	14.5	8.5	9.4	15.0	13.5
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.5	3.5	2.0	2.1	1.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	28.1	34.8	69.4	18.4	35.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	10.2	9.2	9.1	10.1	10.0
First Generation College	2.7	6.2	6.7	16.5	3.4	8.1
Attended Private HS	23.3	22.8	20.4	19.0	22.7	22.1
% FRPL of HS	22.2	22.8	26.1	26.8	22.9	23.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	6.2	0.9	0.5	5.7	5.1
SAT Math score	684.1	676.6	566.9	580.7	662.0	658.5
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	666.8	576.7	580.3	656.0	650.5
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	622.4	486.4	485.3	605.0	596.5
	[603.0, 714.0]	[575.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[350.0, 642.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 17 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to 1.5 times the coefficient on African American.

18

Table 22: Class of 2026 Simulation 2—Simulation 1 + 1.50x Boost for Low SES Family

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	66.1	28.3	40.1	56.6	61.5
African American	7.0	5.3	36.6	26.4	12.2	8.9
Hispanic	10.5	11.3	19.1	19.8	12.0	12.7
Asian American	15.6	13.7	11.3	9.7	14.9	13.0
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.7	0.7	1.1	1.7	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	30.9	40.3	73.1	19.5	38.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.8	9.3	8.9	9.9	9.6
First Generation College	3.2	9.4	15.7	30.2	5.4	13.0
Attended Private HS	21.8	21.3	21.3	19.5	21.7	20.9
% FRPL of HS	22.7	23.3	25.2	26.7	23.1	23.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	4.0	0.4	0.2	4.0	3.3
SAT Math score	686.1	674.3	564.5	567.3	665.0	655.8
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	667.9	569.9	567.5	660.1	650.5
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	618.6	444.9	445.0	604.0	588.6
	[618.0, 714.0]	[570.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[318.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 18 and adds the following: adjust the coefficients on Income <80k and First Generation College to be equal to 1.5 times the coefficient on African American.

19

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

4 Combined Simulation 3 by year

Table 23: Class of 2023 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	66.9	40.3	43.6	59.5	62.4
African American	6.8	5.7	29.9	19.2	11.2	8.3
Hispanic	10.8	11.9	19.1	23.6	12.3	14.1
Asian American	14.9	12.2	5.1	7.4	13.0	11.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.9	4.4	4.4	2.6	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	31.6	45.3	76.1	21.3	40.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.1	8.1	7.4	9.5	8.8
First Generation College	2.6	9.0	11.6	32.1	4.3	13.4
Attended Private HS	25.8	15.9	20.4	12.0	24.8	15.2
% FRPL of HS	21.8	28.1	31.4	38.3	23.7	30.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.9	1.4	0.5	4.5	3.2
SAT Math score	715.1	702.2	584.8	579.1	690.3	678.7
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	702.8	599.6	590.2	692.5	681.4
	[670.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	580.4	421.6	440.4	551.9	553.7
	[470.0, 694.0]	[468.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[312.0, 623.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 19 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .75 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .75 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 24: Class of 2024 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	68.5	38.2	43.8	61.2	64.3
African American	6.8	5.6	31.0	21.6	11.0	8.4
Hispanic	10.3	11.7	20.4	23.5	12.0	13.7
Asian American	13.1	10.6	6.3	7.6	11.9	10.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.4	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	27.2	38.7	69.6	17.6	34.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.9	8.3	7.7	9.4	8.7
First Generation College	2.3	7.8	13.6	32.2	4.2	12.0
Attended Private HS	23.4	13.8	22.9	16.3	23.3	14.2
% FRPL of HS	22.9	28.5	30.7	36.1	24.2	29.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.8	1.6	1.0	5.3	4.1
SAT Math score	711.0	698.2	574.6	574.2	687.6	676.9
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	699.6	588.9	584.1	690.6	679.7
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	581.8	420.5	433.4	556.6	556.3
	[476.0, 694.0]	[474.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[298.0, 594.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 20 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .75 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .75 times the coefficient on African American.

Table 25: Class of 2025 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	66.3	34.2	49.2	57.9	63.0
African American	5.8	4.5	31.8	21.0	10.7	7.6
Hispanic	11.4	11.5	21.4	17.2	13.3	12.6
Asian American	16.5	15.1	8.5	9.8	15.0	14.1
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.4	3.5	1.8	2.1	1.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	28.5	34.8	70.5	18.4	36.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.7	9.2	8.8	10.1	9.6
First Generation College	2.7	6.1	6.7	16.0	3.4	8.0
Attended Private HS	23.3	15.9	20.4	15.4	22.7	15.8
% FRPL of HS	22.2	25.7	26.1	28.9	22.9	26.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.8	0.9	0.5	5.7	4.8
SAT Math score	684.1	675.0	566.9	578.8	662.0	656.9
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	664.3	576.7	578.2	656.0	648.1
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	619.8	486.4	483.4	605.0	594.1
	[603.0, 714.0]	[567.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[350.0, 641.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 21 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .75 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .75 times the coefficient on African American.

21

Table 26: Class of 2026 Simulation 3—Simulation 2 + Disadvantaged Neighborhood/School Boost

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	65.5	28.3	40.2	56.6	61.1
African American	7.0	5.6	36.6	26.0	12.2	9.2
Hispanic	10.5	11.2	19.1	20.2	12.0	12.7
Asian American	15.6	13.9	11.3	9.5	14.9	13.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	1.1	1.7	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	31.0	40.3	73.4	19.5	38.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.5	9.3	8.8	9.9	9.4
First Generation College	3.2	9.4	15.7	30.2	5.4	13.0
Attended Private HS	21.8	14.6	21.3	16.4	21.7	14.9
% FRPL of HS	22.7	26.2	25.2	28.4	23.1	26.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.8	0.4	0.0	4.0	3.2
SAT Math score	686.1	673.0	564.5	566.7	665.0	654.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	666.2	569.9	567.4	660.1	649.1
	[630.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	616.6	444.9	442.6	604.0	586.5
	[618.0, 714.0]	[563.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[318.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 22 and adds the following: adjust the coefficient on Private HS and Average Zip Code Salary to negative .75 times the coefficient on African American, and the coefficient on Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch to .75 times the coefficient on African American.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

5 Combined Simulation 4 by year

Table 27: Class of 2023 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	66.9	40.3	43.6	59.5	62.5
African American	6.8	5.7	29.9	19.2	11.2	8.3
Hispanic	10.8	11.9	19.1	23.6	12.3	14.1
Asian American	14.9	12.2	5.1	7.5	13.0	11.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	1.9	4.4	4.4	2.6	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.8	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	31.6	45.3	76.1	21.3	40.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	9.1	8.1	7.4	9.5	8.8
First Generation College	2.6	9.0	11.6	32.1	4.3	13.4
Attended Private HS	25.8	15.9	20.4	12.0	24.8	15.2
% FRPL of HS	21.8	28.2	31.4	38.3	23.7	30.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.4	1.4	0.7	4.5	2.9
SAT Math score	715.1	702.1	584.8	579.1	690.3	678.7
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	702.9	599.6	590.2	692.5	681.4
	[670.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	580.5	421.6	440.4	551.9	553.8
	[470.0, 694.0]	[468.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[312.0, 623.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 23 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

Table 28: Class of 2024 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	68.6	38.2	43.8	61.2	64.3
African American	6.8	5.6	31.0	21.6	11.0	8.4
Hispanic	10.3	11.7	20.4	23.5	12.0	13.7
Asian American	13.1	10.6	6.3	7.6	11.9	10.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.4	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	27.2	38.7	69.6	17.6	34.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.9	8.3	7.7	9.4	8.7
First Generation College	2.3	7.8	13.6	32.1	4.2	12.0
Attended Private HS	23.4	13.8	22.9	16.3	23.3	14.2
% FRPL of HS	22.9	28.5	30.7	36.1	24.2	29.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.4	1.6	1.2	5.3	3.8
SAT Math score	711.0	698.2	574.6	574.1	687.6	676.9
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	699.5	588.9	584.1	690.6	679.7
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	581.8	420.5	433.1	556.6	556.3
	[476.0, 694.0]	[474.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[298.0, 594.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 24 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

Table 29: Class of 2025 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	66.2	34.2	49.2	57.9	63.0
African American	5.8	4.5	31.8	21.0	10.7	7.6
Hispanic	11.4	11.5	21.4	17.2	13.3	12.6
Asian American	16.5	15.2	8.5	9.8	15.0	14.1
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.5	3.5	1.8	2.1	1.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	28.6	34.8	70.5	18.4	36.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.7	9.2	8.8	10.1	9.5
First Generation College	2.7	6.1	6.7	16.0	3.4	8.0
Attended Private HS	23.3	15.9	20.4	15.4	22.7	15.8
% FRPL of HS	22.2	25.8	26.1	28.9	22.9	26.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.1	0.9	0.6	5.7	4.2
SAT Math score	684.1	674.8	566.9	578.9	662.0	656.7
	[640.0, 750.0]	[630.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	664.2	576.7	578.2	656.0	647.9
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	619.5	486.4	483.5	605.0	593.8
	[603.0, 714.0]	[567.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[350.0, 642.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 25 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

Table 30: Class of 2026 Simulation 4—Simulation 3 + Remove Legacy Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	65.5	28.3	40.2	56.6	61.1
African American	7.0	5.6	36.6	26.0	12.2	9.1
Hispanic	10.5	11.2	19.1	20.2	12.0	12.8
Asian American	15.6	13.9	11.3	9.5	14.9	13.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	1.1	1.7	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	31.1	40.3	73.4	19.5	38.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.5	9.3	8.8	9.9	9.4
First Generation College	3.2	9.4	15.7	30.2	5.4	13.0
Attended Private HS	21.8	14.6	21.3	16.4	21.7	14.9
% FRPL of HS	22.7	26.1	25.2	28.4	23.1	26.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.3	0.4	0.1	4.0	2.8
SAT Math score	686.1	673.0	564.5	566.8	665.0	654.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	666.0	569.9	567.4	660.1	649.0
	[630.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	616.6	444.9	442.6	604.0	586.4
	[618.0, 714.0]	[563.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[318.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 26 and adds the following: Set the coefficients on the Navy Legacy variable to 0.

25

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

6   Combined Simulation 5 by year

Table 31: Class of 2023 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	65.3	40.3	41.9	59.5	60.9
African American	6.8	5.7	29.9	19.2	11.2	8.3
Hispanic	10.8	12.6	19.1	25.1	12.3	15.0
Asian American	14.9	12.8	5.1	7.7	13.0	11.8
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.1	4.4	4.6	2.6	2.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.5	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	33.4	45.3	79.4	21.3	42.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.8	8.1	7.2	9.5	8.5
First Generation College	2.6	9.4	11.6	33.0	4.3	13.9
Attended Private HS	25.8	13.7	20.4	10.8	24.8	13.2
% FRPL of HS	21.8	29.4	31.4	39.7	23.7	31.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	1.7	7.6	0.5	11.8	1.5
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.7	1.4	0.8	4.5	3.1
SAT Math score	715.1	706.7	584.8	580.1	690.3	682.5
	[660.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	707.9	599.6	592.1	692.5	685.8
	[670.0, 780.0]	[660.0, 770.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	595.8	421.6	452.0	551.9	568.3
	[470.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[322.0, 630.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 27 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

Table 32: Class of 2024 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	67.7	38.2	42.9	61.2	63.4
African American	6.8	5.4	31.0	20.6	11.0	8.0
Hispanic	10.3	12.1	20.4	24.7	12.0	14.3
Asian American	13.1	11.0	6.3	7.8	11.9	10.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.5	3.5	3.0	2.9	2.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.9	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	28.8	38.7	74.3	17.6	36.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.3	8.3	7.4	9.4	8.1
First Generation College	2.3	8.1	13.6	33.5	4.2	12.5
Attended Private HS	23.4	12.4	22.9	13.3	23.3	12.6
% FRPL of HS	22.9	29.7	30.7	37.7	24.2	31.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	2.9	8.6	0.5	13.6	2.5
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.4	1.6	1.4	5.3	3.9
SAT Math score	711.0	702.8	574.6	575.1	687.6	680.9
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	705.2	588.9	586.5	690.6	684.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[660.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	598.7	420.5	447.2	556.6	572.7
	[476.0, 694.0]	[511.0, 697.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[315.0, 622.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 28 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

Table 33: Class of 2025 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	65.9	34.2	49.3	57.9	62.8
African American	5.8	4.5	31.8	20.5	10.7	7.5
Hispanic	11.4	11.6	21.4	17.0	13.3	12.6
Asian American	16.5	15.3	8.5	10.3	15.0	14.4
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.6	3.5	1.9	2.1	1.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	29.6	34.8	73.0	18.4	37.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.4	9.2	8.8	10.1	9.3
First Generation College	2.7	6.3	6.7	16.3	3.4	8.2
Attended Private HS	23.3	14.5	20.4	15.0	22.7	14.6
% FRPL of HS	22.2	26.5	26.1	29.1	22.9	27.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	3.6	5.0	1.0	11.9	3.1
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.2	0.9	0.7	5.7	4.3
SAT Math score	684.1	679.9	566.9	580.6	662.0	661.2
	[640.0, 750.0]	[640.0, 750.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	669.8	576.7	580.2	656.0	652.9
	[640.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 730.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	627.7	486.4	489.1	605.0	601.5
	[603.0, 714.0]	[598.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[356.0, 646.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 29 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

Table 34: Class of 2026 Simulation 5—Simulation 4 + Remove Boutique Sports Preferences

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	64.0	28.3	39.7	56.6	59.8
African American	7.0	6.0	36.6	25.7	12.2	9.4
Hispanic	10.5	11.7	19.1	20.4	12.0	13.2
Asian American	15.6	14.3	11.3	10.0	14.9	13.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.1	4.0	3.1	2.7	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.9	0.7	1.2	1.7	1.7
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	32.3	40.3	76.5	19.5	40.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.4	9.3	8.8	9.9	9.2
First Generation College	3.2	9.6	15.7	30.6	5.4	13.3
Attended Private HS	21.8	13.3	21.3	15.9	21.7	13.8
% FRPL of HS	22.7	26.8	25.2	28.6	23.1	27.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	3.3	5.1	0.6	11.0	2.8
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.6	0.4	0.1	4.0	3.0
SAT Math score	686.1	675.4	564.5	568.7	665.0	656.9
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	669.1	569.9	570.3	660.1	652.0
	[630.0, 730.0]	[630.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	622.5	444.9	447.2	604.0	592.1
	[618.0, 714.0]	[587.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[322.0, 603.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 30 and adds the following: have Blue Chip Athletes in Boutique Sports compete for admission with everyone else. Boutique Sports are all sports that are not Football or Men's/Women's Basketball and include the following: Baseball, Cross Country/Track & Field, Golf, Gymnastics, Lacrosse, Rifle shooting, Rowing, Rugby, Sailing, Soccer, Sprint Football, Squash, Swimming & Diving, Tennis, Triathlon, Volleyball, Water Polo, and Wrestling.

7   Combined Simulation 6 by year

Table 35: Class of 2023 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	66.6	40.3	44.5	59.5	62.4
African American	6.8	5.7	29.9	19.0	11.2	8.2
Hispanic	10.8	12.7	19.1	23.4	12.3	14.8
Asian American	14.9	11.5	5.1	6.6	13.0	10.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.0	4.4	4.6	2.6	2.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.8	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	33.2	45.3	76.3	21.3	41.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.9	8.1	7.3	9.5	8.6
First Generation College	2.6	9.4	11.6	31.5	4.3	13.6
Attended Private HS	25.8	25.1	20.4	19.1	24.8	24.0
% FRPL of HS	21.8	26.2	31.4	35.3	23.7	27.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.8	1.4	0.4	4.5	3.2
SAT Math score	715.1	698.7	584.8	577.8	690.3	675.6
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	701.3	599.6	589.2	692.5	680.0
	[670.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	579.3	421.6	436.4	551.9	552.0
	[470.0, 694.0]	[468.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[308.0, 622.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 23 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.75 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 36: Class of 2024 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	68.3	38.2	44.2	61.2	64.1
African American	6.8	5.6	31.0	21.3	11.0	8.3
Hispanic	10.3	12.1	20.4	23.7	12.0	14.1
Asian American	13.1	10.6	6.3	7.3	11.9	10.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.7	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.6	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	28.4	38.7	69.0	17.6	35.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.7	8.3	7.8	9.4	8.6
First Generation College	2.3	8.6	13.6	33.6	4.2	12.9
Attended Private HS	23.4	22.7	22.9	24.0	23.3	22.9
% FRPL of HS	22.9	26.5	30.7	33.1	24.2	27.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.8	1.6	1.0	5.3	4.2
SAT Math score	711.0	696.2	574.6	572.3	687.6	674.9
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	698.9	588.9	583.3	690.6	679.0
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	580.2	420.5	426.3	556.6	553.8
	[476.0, 694.0]	[476.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[296.0, 567.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 24 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.75 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 37: Class of 2025 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	66.1	34.2	48.2	57.9	62.7
African American	5.8	4.8	31.8	21.1	10.7	7.9
Hispanic	11.4	12.1	21.4	18.1	13.3	13.2
Asian American	16.5	14.0	8.5	9.3	15.0	13.2
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.8	3.5	2.2	2.1	1.9
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.1	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	29.3	34.8	67.8	18.4	36.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.5	9.2	8.8	10.1	9.4
First Generation College	2.7	6.4	6.7	16.5	3.4	8.3
Attended Private HS	23.3	24.6	20.4	20.2	22.7	23.8
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.1	26.1	27.4	22.9	24.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.6	0.9	0.3	5.7	4.6
SAT Math score	684.1	670.9	566.9	577.4	662.0	653.3
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	662.2	576.7	577.4	656.0	646.2
	[640.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	619.4	486.4	486.3	605.0	594.3
	[603.0, 714.0]	[567.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[350.0, 642.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 25 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.75 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

Table 38: Class of 2026 Simulation 6—Simulation 3 + Remove or Reduce Boosts for HS College % and AP/Honors & Extracurricular Activities

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	65.5	28.3	40.1	56.6	61.1
African American	7.0	5.6	36.6	26.5	12.2	9.3
Hispanic	10.5	11.7	19.1	20.4	12.0	13.2
Asian American	15.6	13.3	11.3	9.3	14.9	12.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.1	4.0	2.8	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	0.8	1.7	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	32.8	40.3	73.0	19.5	39.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.3	9.3	8.8	9.9	9.2
First Generation College	3.2	9.6	15.7	29.7	5.4	13.1
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.8	21.3	20.5	21.7	22.4
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.5	25.2	27.0	23.1	24.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.9	0.4	0.3	4.0	3.3
SAT Math score	686.1	668.6	564.5	565.4	665.0	650.8
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	663.6	569.9	566.1	660.1	646.7
	[630.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	612.3	444.9	445.1	604.0	583.3
	[618.0, 714.0]	[555.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[320.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 26 and adds the following: Set the coefficient on Percent 4-year College to -.75 times the coefficient on African American and set the coefficient on AP/IB/Honors Coursework (RAB) to zero. Also, halve the coefficients on WPM Extracurricular Athletic and WPM Extracurricular Non-athletic scores.

31

8   Combined Simulation 7 by year

Table 39: Class of 2023 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	66.6	40.3	44.9	59.5	62.5
African American	6.8	5.7	29.9	20.3	11.2	8.5
Hispanic	10.8	12.7	19.1	21.1	12.3	14.3
Asian American	14.9	11.5	5.1	7.2	13.0	10.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.0	4.4	5.1	2.6	2.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.6	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	33.2	45.3	87.1	21.3	43.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.9	8.1	7.9	9.5	8.7
First Generation College	2.6	9.4	11.6	14.3	4.3	10.3
Attended Private HS	25.8	25.1	20.4	18.5	24.8	23.9
% FRPL of HS	21.8	26.2	31.4	31.1	23.7	27.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.8	1.4	1.0	4.5	3.3
SAT Math score	715.1	698.7	584.8	582.5	690.3	676.5
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	701.3	599.6	594.7	692.5	681.0
	[670.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	579.3	421.6	429.1	551.9	550.6
	[470.0, 694.0]	[468.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[301.0, 589.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 35 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

Table 40: Class of 2024 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	68.3	38.2	45.3	61.2	64.3
African American	6.8	5.6	31.0	22.4	11.0	8.5
Hispanic	10.3	12.1	20.4	21.2	12.0	13.7
Asian American	13.1	10.6	6.3	7.8	11.9	10.1
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.6	2.9	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	28.4	38.7	81.7	17.6	37.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.7	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.6
First Generation College	2.3	8.6	13.6	18.4	4.2	10.3
Attended Private HS	23.4	22.7	22.9	20.6	23.3	22.3
% FRPL of HS	22.9	26.5	30.7	31.6	24.2	27.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.8	1.6	1.5	5.3	4.3
SAT Math score	711.0	696.2	574.6	578.8	687.6	676.1
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	698.9	588.9	589.0	690.6	680.0
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	580.2	420.5	429.2	556.6	554.3
	[476.0, 694.0]	[476.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[297.0, 570.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 36 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

Table 41: Class of 2025 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	66.1	34.2	50.4	57.9	63.1
African American	5.8	4.8	31.8	20.5	10.7	7.8
Hispanic	11.4	12.1	21.4	16.4	13.3	12.9
Asian American	16.5	14.0	8.5	9.7	15.0	13.2
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.8	3.5	2.0	2.1	1.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	0.9	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	29.3	34.8	80.5	18.4	39.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.5	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.5
First Generation College	2.7	6.4	6.7	9.1	3.4	6.9
Attended Private HS	23.3	24.6	20.4	17.6	22.7	23.3
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.1	26.1	26.7	22.9	24.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.6	0.9	0.8	5.7	4.7
SAT Math score	684.1	670.9	566.9	587.2	662.0	655.1
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 660.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	662.2	576.7	585.1	656.0	647.6
	[640.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	619.4	486.4	487.6	605.0	594.5
	[603.0, 714.0]	[567.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[350.0, 644.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 37 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

Table 42: Class of 2026 Simulation 7—Simulation 6 + Reserve non-athlete NAPS for Low-Income

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	65.5	28.3	42.9	56.6	61.6
African American	7.0	5.6	36.6	26.0	12.2	9.2
Hispanic	10.5	11.7	19.1	17.7	12.0	12.7
Asian American	15.6	13.3	11.3	9.7	14.9	12.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.1	4.0	3.0	2.7	2.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	0.8	1.7	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	32.8	40.3	81.3	19.5	41.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.3	9.3	8.9	9.9	9.2
First Generation College	3.2	9.6	15.7	20.2	5.4	11.4
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.8	21.3	19.9	21.7	22.3
% FRPL of HS	22.7	24.5	25.2	26.0	23.1	24.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.9	0.4	0.4	4.0	3.3
SAT Math score	686.1	668.6	564.5	573.9	665.0	652.2
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	663.6	569.9	574.8	660.1	648.3
	[630.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	612.3	444.9	453.6	604.0	584.8
	[618.0, 714.0]	[555.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[323.0, 612.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 38 and sets the coefficient on Income <80k in the NAPS admission model to an exceedingly high number such that it is determinative of NAPS admission for non-Blue Chip Athletes.

9   Combined Simulation 8 by year

Table 43: Class of 2023 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	65.8	40.3	51.1	59.5	60.2
African American	6.8	5.7	29.9	14.4	11.2	9.0
Hispanic	10.8	13.1	19.1	20.0	12.3	15.7
Asian American	14.9	11.8	5.1	10.1	13.0	11.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.1	4.4	3.5	2.6	2.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.0	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	37.2	45.3	89.2	21.3	57.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.8	8.1	8.0	9.5	8.5
First Generation College	2.6	11.1	11.6	12.5	4.3	11.6
Attended Private HS	25.8	25.5	20.4	16.1	24.8	21.9
% FRPL of HS	21.8	26.8	31.4	31.4	23.7	28.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.8	7.6	3.1	11.8	9.1
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.6	1.4	1.4	4.5	2.8
SAT Math score	715.1	700.7	584.8	612.9	690.3	667.2
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[550.0, 670.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	702.9	599.6	622.1	692.5	672.1
	[670.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[570.0, 680.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	587.0	421.6	448.2	551.9	534.1
	[470.0, 694.0]	[479.0, 695.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[323.0, 622.0]		
N	1,099	840	259	518	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

Table 44: Class of 2024 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	67.4	38.2	51.3	61.2	61.9
African American	6.8	5.6	31.0	15.4	11.0	9.0
Hispanic	10.3	12.7	20.4	20.4	12.0	15.4
Asian American	13.1	10.8	6.3	9.3	11.9	10.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.2	3.5	2.8	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	31.5	38.7	75.6	17.6	46.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.5	8.3	8.1	9.4	8.4
First Generation College	2.3	9.8	13.6	14.8	4.2	11.5
Attended Private HS	23.4	23.0	22.9	20.1	23.3	22.0
% FRPL of HS	22.9	27.3	30.7	29.8	24.2	28.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	13.9	8.6	3.8	13.6	10.4
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.7	1.6	1.9	5.3	3.7
SAT Math score	711.0	698.3	574.6	607.4	687.6	667.1
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[560.0, 660.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	701.5	588.9	616.0	690.6	672.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[560.0, 680.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	587.0	420.5	446.1	556.6	538.7
	[476.0, 694.0]	[497.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[323.0, 597.0]		
N	1,173	930	243	486	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

Table 45: Class of 2025 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	65.2	34.2	55.2	57.9	61.4
African American	5.8	4.7	31.8	15.9	10.7	8.9
Hispanic	11.4	12.9	21.4	15.0	13.3	13.7
Asian American	16.5	14.1	8.5	10.6	15.0	12.8
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.9	3.5	2.2	2.1	2.0
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.3	0.7	1.2	1.0	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	34.6	34.8	60.5	18.4	44.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.3	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.3
First Generation College	2.7	7.8	6.7	7.4	3.4	7.6
Attended Private HS	23.3	24.2	20.4	18.0	22.7	21.9
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.7	26.1	25.9	22.9	25.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.9	5.0	2.9	11.9	9.8
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.7	0.9	1.4	5.7	4.1
SAT Math score	684.1	671.5	566.9	592.1	662.0	641.6
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 670.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	661.2	576.7	594.0	656.0	635.8
	[640.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[550.0, 670.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	621.8	486.4	509.6	605.0	579.4
	[603.0, 714.0]	[581.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[361.0, 665.0]		
N	1,105	848	257	514	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Table 46: Class of 2026 Simulation 8—Simulation 7 + Double NAPS slots at USNA

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	64.4	28.3	49.9	56.6	59.4
African American	7.0	6.1	36.6	19.7	12.2	10.8
Hispanic	10.5	12.2	19.1	16.6	12.0	13.7
Asian American	15.6	13.5	11.3	10.0	14.9	12.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	2.5	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.8	0.7	1.2	1.7	1.6
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	39.0	40.3	67.1	19.5	48.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.1	9.3	8.9	9.9	9.0
First Generation College	3.2	12.2	15.7	16.6	5.4	13.7
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.4	21.3	19.7	21.7	21.5
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.2	25.2	25.8	23.1	25.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	11.6	5.1	3.1	11.0	8.7
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.9	0.4	0.8	4.0	2.8
SAT Math score	686.1	667.9	564.5	582.7	665.0	638.4
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	663.4	569.9	586.7	660.1	636.8
	[630.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[540.0, 650.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	617.5	444.9	470.6	604.0	566.6
	[618.0, 714.0]	[567.0, 713.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[337.0, 631.0]		
N	1,155	913	242	484	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and doubles the allotment of USNA students coming from NAPS

37

10   Combined Simulation 9 by year

Table 47: Class of 2023 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	61.3	40.3	38.1	59.5	56.9
African American	6.8	6.9	29.9	22.7	11.2	9.9
Hispanic	10.8	17.2	19.1	26.1	12.3	18.9
Asian American	14.9	10.6	5.1	5.9	13.0	9.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.7	4.4	5.7	2.6	3.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	36.1	45.3	87.2	21.3	45.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.8	8.1	7.9	9.5	8.6
First Generation College	2.6	10.8	11.6	15.6	4.3	11.7
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.8	20.4	18.9	24.8	23.7
% FRPL of HS	21.8	26.9	31.4	31.2	23.7	27.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.6	1.4	0.8	4.5	3.0
SAT Math score	715.1	696.4	584.8	577.5	690.3	673.7
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	699.2	599.6	589.9	692.5	678.3
	[670.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	580.8	421.6	424.2	551.9	550.9
	[470.0, 694.0]	[470.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[295.0, 584.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 48: Class of 2024 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	62.9	38.2	38.5	61.2	58.7
African American	6.8	7.0	31.0	25.2	11.0	10.1
Hispanic	10.3	16.3	20.4	26.0	12.0	17.9
Asian American	13.1	9.8	6.3	6.6	11.9	9.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	3.1	3.5	3.1	2.9	3.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.0	0.5	0.6	1.0	0.9
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	31.2	38.7	81.7	17.6	39.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.7	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.5
First Generation College	2.3	10.0	13.6	19.8	4.2	11.7
Attended Private HS	23.4	22.3	22.9	20.8	23.3	22.1
% FRPL of HS	22.9	27.4	30.7	32.2	24.2	28.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.6	1.6	1.5	5.3	4.1
SAT Math score	711.0	693.9	574.6	573.1	687.6	673.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	697.2	588.9	582.8	690.6	677.5
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	581.2	420.5	429.1	556.6	555.1
	[476.0, 694.0]	[479.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[296.0, 581.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 49: Class of 2025 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	61.3	34.2	43.8	57.9	58.0
African American	5.8	5.9	31.8	23.4	10.7	9.2
Hispanic	11.4	16.3	21.4	21.6	13.3	17.3
Asian American	16.5	13.0	8.5	7.9	15.0	12.1
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	2.4	3.5	2.5	2.1	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.7	0.8	1.0	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	32.5	34.8	80.5	18.4	41.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.5	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.4
First Generation College	2.7	7.6	6.7	10.2	3.4	8.1
Attended Private HS	23.3	24.7	20.4	18.5	22.7	23.5
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.6	26.1	26.6	22.9	24.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.4	0.9	0.6	5.7	4.5
SAT Math score	684.1	667.0	566.9	580.6	662.0	650.7
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	658.4	576.7	580.4	656.0	643.7
	[640.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	618.5	486.4	482.7	605.0	592.9
	[603.0, 714.0]	[565.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 638.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 50: Class of 2026 Simulation 9—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	60.2	28.3	35.1	56.6	55.9
African American	7.0	7.4	36.6	30.1	12.2	11.4
Hispanic	10.5	15.8	19.1	22.1	12.0	16.9
Asian American	15.6	12.2	11.3	8.3	14.9	11.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.7	4.0	3.7	2.7	2.9
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.6	0.7	0.7	1.7	1.4
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	36.6	40.3	81.3	19.5	44.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.2	9.3	9.0	9.9	9.2
First Generation College	3.2	11.4	15.7	21.7	5.4	13.2
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.7	21.3	20.2	21.7	22.3
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.0	25.2	26.1	23.1	25.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.8	0.4	0.3	4.0	3.2
SAT Math score	686.1	664.4	564.5	567.7	665.0	647.7
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	659.9	569.9	568.5	660.1	644.0
	[630.0, 730.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	608.7	444.9	444.9	604.0	580.4
	[618.0, 714.0]	[547.0, 710.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[318.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

11 Combined Simulation 10 by year

Table 51: Class of 2023 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	56.8	40.3	33.5	59.5	52.4
African American	6.8	7.9	29.9	24.2	11.2	11.0
Hispanic	10.8	21.0	19.1	29.7	12.3	22.6
Asian American	14.9	9.8	5.1	5.0	13.0	8.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	3.3	4.4	6.1	2.6	3.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	38.7	45.3	87.1	21.3	47.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.7	8.1	8.0	9.5	8.6
First Generation College	2.6	12.1	11.6	16.6	4.3	12.9
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.5	20.4	19.3	24.8	23.5
% FRPL of HS	21.8	27.5	31.4	31.2	23.7	28.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.4	1.4	0.7	4.5	2.8
SAT Math score	715.1	694.5	584.8	574.0	690.3	671.5
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	697.4	599.6	586.7	692.5	676.3
	[670.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	582.2	421.6	419.5	551.9	551.2
	[470.0, 694.0]	[470.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[288.0, 572.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 52: Class of 2024 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	58.3	38.2	33.8	61.2	54.1
African American	6.8	8.1	31.0	27.3	11.0	11.4
Hispanic	10.3	19.8	20.4	29.2	12.0	21.4
Asian American	13.1	9.1	6.3	5.8	11.9	8.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	3.7	3.5	3.4	2.9	3.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	0.9	0.5	0.5	1.0	0.8
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	33.7	38.7	81.7	17.6	42.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.6	8.3	7.9	9.4	8.5
First Generation College	2.3	11.4	13.6	21.0	4.2	13.1
Attended Private HS	23.4	22.0	22.9	21.0	23.3	21.8
% FRPL of HS	22.9	28.2	30.7	32.5	24.2	28.9
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.4	1.6	1.4	5.3	3.9
SAT Math score	711.0	691.8	574.6	568.9	687.6	670.7
	[660.0, 770.0]	[630.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	695.6	588.9	578.3	690.6	675.5
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	582.1	420.5	429.0	556.6	555.8
	[476.0, 694.0]	[484.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[292.0, 581.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 53: Class of 2025 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	57.2	34.2	38.5	57.9	53.7
African American	5.8	6.8	31.8	25.5	10.7	10.3
Hispanic	11.4	19.9	21.4	25.8	13.3	21.0
Asian American	16.5	12.2	8.5	6.6	15.0	11.2
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	2.8	3.5	2.9	2.1	2.8
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.1	0.7	0.7	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	35.3	34.8	80.5	18.4	43.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.4	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.3
First Generation College	2.7	8.7	6.7	11.0	3.4	9.2
Attended Private HS	23.3	24.7	20.4	19.1	22.7	23.6
% FRPL of HS	22.2	25.0	26.1	26.4	22.9	25.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.2	0.9	0.5	5.7	4.3
SAT Math score	684.1	663.7	566.9	575.8	662.0	647.1
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	655.1	576.7	577.0	656.0	640.4
	[640.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	617.7	486.4	479.6	605.0	591.6
	[603.0, 714.0]	[565.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 636.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Table 54: Class of 2026 Simulation 10—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	55.7	28.3	29.6	56.6	51.2
African American	7.0	9.0	36.6	33.2	12.2	13.2
Hispanic	10.5	19.3	19.1	25.2	12.0	20.3
Asian American	15.6	11.4	11.3	7.3	14.9	10.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	3.2	4.0	4.2	2.7	3.3
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.5	0.7	0.5	1.7	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	39.9	40.3	81.3	19.5	47.1
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.1	9.3	9.1	9.9	9.1
First Generation College	3.2	13.2	15.7	22.5	5.4	14.8
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.6	21.3	20.4	21.7	22.2
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.4	25.2	26.0	23.1	25.5
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.7	0.4	0.2	4.0	3.1
SAT Math score	686.1	660.6	564.5	563.4	665.0	643.7
	[640.0, 750.0]	[600.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	656.4	569.9	563.9	660.1	640.4
	[630.0, 730.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	605.6	444.9	437.4	604.0	576.5
	[618.0, 714.0]	[539.0, 710.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[314.0, 594.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

43

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

12   Combined Simulation 11 by year

Table 55: Class of 2023 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	49.8	40.3	27.6	59.5	45.6
African American	6.8	9.3	29.9	26.1	11.2	12.5
Hispanic	10.8	27.0	19.1	34.5	12.3	28.4
Asian American	14.9	8.6	5.1	3.9	13.0	7.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	4.2	4.4	6.7	2.6	4.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.0	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	42.8	45.3	87.1	21.3	51.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.6	8.1	8.1	9.5	8.5
First Generation College	2.6	14.3	11.6	18.1	4.3	15.0
Attended Private HS	25.8	23.9	20.4	20.1	24.8	23.2
% FRPL of HS	21.8	28.6	31.4	30.8	23.7	29.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.0	1.4	0.5	4.5	2.5
SAT Math score	715.1	691.9	584.8	569.5	690.3	668.5
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	694.8	599.6	582.6	692.5	673.4
	[670.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	585.0	421.6	411.1	551.9	551.8
	[470.0, 694.0]	[476.0, 695.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[287.0, 543.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 56: Class of 2024 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	51.1	38.2	27.7	61.2	47.1
African American	6.8	9.8	31.0	30.3	11.0	13.3
Hispanic	10.3	25.7	20.4	33.1	12.0	27.0
Asian American	13.1	8.0	6.3	4.7	11.9	7.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	4.6	3.5	3.8	2.9	4.5
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	0.8	0.5	0.4	1.0	0.7
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	38.0	38.7	81.7	17.6	45.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.5	8.3	7.9	9.4	8.4
First Generation College	2.3	13.9	13.6	22.7	4.2	15.4
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.3	22.9	21.3	23.3	21.3
% FRPL of HS	22.9	29.6	30.7	32.7	24.2	30.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.0	1.6	1.2	5.3	3.5
SAT Math score	711.0	688.3	574.6	563.1	687.6	666.8
	[660.0, 770.0]	[620.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 600.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	693.0	588.9	572.2	690.6	672.3
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	583.8	420.5	428.7	556.6	557.2
	[476.0, 694.0]	[489.0, 695.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[290.0, 597.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 57: Class of 2025 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	50.5	34.2	31.2	57.9	46.8
African American	5.8	8.1	31.8	28.2	10.7	11.9
Hispanic	11.4	26.0	21.4	31.7	13.3	27.1
Asian American	16.5	10.9	8.5	5.0	15.0	9.8
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	3.6	3.5	3.3	2.1	3.6
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.0	0.7	0.6	1.0	0.9
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	40.4	34.8	80.5	18.4	48.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.3	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.3
First Generation College	2.7	10.8	6.7	11.7	3.4	11.0
Attended Private HS	23.3	24.5	20.4	20.0	22.7	23.7
% FRPL of HS	22.2	25.7	26.1	26.0	22.9	25.8
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	4.9	0.9	0.3	5.7	4.0
SAT Math score	684.1	658.1	566.9	569.5	662.0	641.4
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 730.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	649.6	576.7	572.6	656.0	635.1
	[640.0, 730.0]	[610.0, 710.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	616.3	486.4	476.5	605.0	590.0
	[603.0, 714.0]	[563.0, 711.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[349.0, 633.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 58: Class of 2026 Simulation 11—Simulation 7 + increase URM applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	48.4	28.3	22.6	56.6	43.9
African American	7.0	11.5	36.6	37.7	12.2	16.1
Hispanic	10.5	25.1	19.1	28.7	12.0	25.8
Asian American	15.6	10.0	11.3	5.8	14.9	9.3
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	3.6	4.0	4.8	2.7	3.9
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.2	0.7	0.3	1.7	1.1
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	45.6	40.3	81.3	19.5	51.8
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.0	9.3	9.1	9.9	9.0
First Generation College	3.2	16.5	15.7	23.3	5.4	17.7
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.3	21.3	20.7	21.7	22.1
% FRPL of HS	22.7	26.2	25.2	25.8	23.1	26.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.5	0.4	0.1	4.0	2.9
SAT Math score	686.1	653.8	564.5	557.8	665.0	637.2
	[640.0, 750.0]	[600.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 590.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	650.0	569.9	557.8	660.1	634.0
	[630.0, 730.0]	[610.0, 710.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[510.0, 610.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	600.3	444.9	425.1	604.0	569.9
	[618.0, 714.0]	[519.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[303.0, 559.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the URM applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

13   Combined Simulation 12 by year

Table 59: Class of 2023 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	64.3	40.3	44.4	59.5	60.5
African American	6.8	6.1	29.9	20.1	11.2	8.8
Hispanic	10.8	13.8	19.1	21.5	12.3	15.3
Asian American	14.9	12.2	5.1	7.0	13.0	11.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.2	4.4	5.1	2.6	2.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.8	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	44.1	45.3	87.2	21.3	52.3
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.7	8.1	7.9	9.5	8.5
First Generation College	2.6	11.6	11.6	14.9	4.3	12.3
Attended Private HS	25.8	24.3	20.4	19.8	24.8	23.4
% FRPL of HS	21.8	27.4	31.4	30.3	23.7	28.0
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	3.3	1.4	0.8	4.5	2.8
SAT Math score	715.1	695.6	584.8	580.0	690.3	673.6
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	698.3	599.6	591.5	692.5	677.9
	[670.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	580.3	421.6	421.4	551.9	550.0
	[470.0, 694.0]	[470.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[290.0, 567.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 60: Class of 2024 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	66.0	38.2	44.2	61.2	62.2
African American	6.8	6.1	31.0	22.9	11.0	9.0
Hispanic	10.3	13.5	20.4	21.4	12.0	14.9
Asian American	13.1	11.1	6.3	8.2	11.9	10.6
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.6	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.0	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.0
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	38.2	38.7	81.7	17.6	45.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.6	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.5
First Generation College	2.3	10.9	13.6	20.0	4.2	12.5
Attended Private HS	23.4	22.0	22.9	21.2	23.3	21.8
% FRPL of HS	22.9	27.7	30.7	31.4	24.2	28.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.4	1.6	1.6	5.3	3.9
SAT Math score	711.0	691.8	574.6	572.0	687.6	671.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[530.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	695.3	588.9	582.3	690.6	675.9
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	578.7	420.5	423.8	556.6	552.1
	[476.0, 694.0]	[474.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[292.0, 567.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 61: Class of 2025 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	63.7	34.2	48.1	57.9	60.7
African American	5.8	5.2	31.8	21.2	10.7	8.2
Hispanic	11.4	13.4	21.4	18.9	13.3	14.4
Asian American	16.5	14.7	8.5	8.8	15.0	13.6
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.8	3.5	2.1	2.1	1.9
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	40.4	34.8	80.5	18.4	48.0
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.4	9.2	9.1	10.1	9.4
First Generation College	2.7	7.9	6.7	9.3	3.4	8.1
Attended Private HS	23.3	23.6	20.4	18.8	22.7	22.7
% FRPL of HS	22.2	24.9	26.1	26.3	22.9	25.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	5.1	0.9	0.6	5.7	4.2
SAT Math score	684.1	667.3	566.9	583.4	662.0	651.5
	[640.0, 750.0]	[620.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 650.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	657.7	576.7	582.3	656.0	643.5
	[640.0, 730.0]	[620.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[540.0, 640.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	616.1	486.4	480.2	605.0	590.5
	[603.0, 714.0]	[563.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[348.0, 636.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 62: Class of 2026 Simulation 12—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 50%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	62.9	28.3	39.4	56.6	58.8
African American	7.0	6.5	36.6	27.9	12.2	10.2
Hispanic	10.5	12.9	19.1	18.4	12.0	13.9
Asian American	15.6	14.1	11.3	10.3	14.9	13.4
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	2.0	4.0	3.3	2.7	2.2
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.6	0.7	0.7	1.7	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	45.3	40.3	81.3	19.5	51.5
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.1	9.3	9.1	9.9	9.1
First Generation College	3.2	12.5	15.7	21.5	5.4	14.1
Attended Private HS	21.8	22.0	21.3	20.4	21.7	21.7
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.1	25.2	25.6	23.1	25.2
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	3.4	0.4	0.2	4.0	2.8
SAT Math score	686.1	662.7	564.5	571.2	665.0	646.9
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	658.0	569.9	571.4	660.1	643.0
	[630.0, 730.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	605.7	444.9	443.5	604.0	577.6
	[618.0, 714.0]	[538.0, 709.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[315.0, 598.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 50%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

49

14   Combined Simulation 13 by year

Table 63: Class of 2023 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	62.6	40.3	44.3	59.5	59.1
African American	6.8	6.3	29.9	19.9	11.2	8.9
Hispanic	10.8	14.6	19.1	21.8	12.3	16.0
Asian American	14.9	12.9	5.1	6.9	13.0	11.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.3	4.4	5.1	2.6	2.9
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.3	1.2	2.1	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	52.3	45.3	87.1	21.3	58.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.5	8.1	8.0	9.5	8.4
First Generation College	2.6	13.5	11.6	15.3	4.3	13.9
Attended Private HS	25.8	23.6	20.4	20.8	24.8	23.1
% FRPL of HS	21.8	28.5	31.4	29.7	23.7	28.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	2.9	1.4	0.7	4.5	2.5
SAT Math score	715.1	694.1	584.8	578.9	690.3	672.1
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	696.3	599.6	589.6	692.5	676.0
	[670.0, 780.0]	[650.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	582.2	421.6	414.2	551.9	550.2
	[470.0, 694.0]	[474.0, 694.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[288.0, 543.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 64: Class of 2024 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	64.1	38.2	43.5	61.2	60.5
African American	6.8	6.5	31.0	23.5	11.0	9.4
Hispanic	10.3	14.7	20.4	21.3	12.0	15.9
Asian American	13.1	11.5	6.3	8.5	11.9	10.9
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.3	3.5	2.5	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	0.9	0.5	0.7	1.0	0.9
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	46.0	38.7	81.7	17.6	52.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.5	8.3	8.0	9.4	8.4
First Generation College	2.3	12.9	13.6	21.1	4.2	14.3
Attended Private HS	23.4	21.3	22.9	21.8	23.3	21.4
% FRPL of HS	22.9	28.7	30.7	31.2	24.2	29.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	4.0	1.6	1.7	5.3	3.6
SAT Math score	711.0	688.4	574.6	567.5	687.6	667.7
	[660.0, 770.0]	[630.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	692.6	588.9	577.9	690.6	672.9
	[660.0, 770.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	578.0	420.5	418.5	556.6	550.6
	[476.0, 694.0]	[474.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[290.0, 565.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 65: Class of 2025 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	61.6	34.2	46.4	57.9	58.7
African American	5.8	5.4	31.8	21.5	10.7	8.5
Hispanic	11.4	14.6	21.4	20.3	13.3	15.7
Asian American	16.5	15.3	8.5	8.6	15.0	14.0
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.8	3.5	2.1	2.1	1.9
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	49.5	34.8	80.5	18.4	55.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.3	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.3
First Generation College	2.7	9.2	6.7	9.1	3.4	9.2
Attended Private HS	23.3	22.6	20.4	19.5	22.7	22.0
% FRPL of HS	22.2	25.5	26.1	25.9	22.9	25.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	4.6	0.9	0.4	5.7	3.8
SAT Math score	684.1	664.9	566.9	580.9	662.0	649.1
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	654.5	576.7	580.3	656.0	640.5
	[640.0, 730.0]	[610.0, 720.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	614.5	486.4	474.5	605.0	588.1
	[603.0, 714.0]	[559.0, 713.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[348.0, 632.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 66: Class of 2026 Simulation 13—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 100%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	60.6	28.3	37.2	56.6	56.5
African American	7.0	7.3	36.6	29.2	12.2	11.1
Hispanic	10.5	13.9	19.1	18.7	12.0	14.8
Asian American	15.6	14.9	11.3	10.9	14.9	14.2
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	1.8	4.0	3.4	2.7	2.0
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.5	0.7	0.6	1.7	1.3
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	55.1	40.3	81.3	19.5	59.6
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	9.0	9.3	9.2	9.9	9.1
First Generation College	3.2	15.2	15.7	22.4	5.4	16.5
Attended Private HS	21.8	21.3	21.3	20.7	21.7	21.2
% FRPL of HS	22.7	25.6	25.2	25.3	23.1	25.6
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	2.9	0.4	0.2	4.0	2.4
SAT Math score	686.1	658.5	564.5	569.8	665.0	643.1
	[640.0, 750.0]	[600.0, 720.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	653.7	569.9	569.4	660.1	639.1
	[630.0, 730.0]	[610.0, 710.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	601.7	444.9	434.5	604.0	572.8
	[618.0, 714.0]	[527.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[310.0, 581.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 100%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

15   Combined Simulation 14 by year

Table 67: Class of 2023 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	64.0	60.3	40.3	44.1	59.5	57.2
African American	6.8	6.4	29.9	19.5	11.2	8.9
Hispanic	10.8	15.5	19.1	22.2	12.3	16.8
Asian American	14.9	13.9	5.1	6.6	13.0	12.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.2	2.6	4.4	5.0	2.6	3.1
Declined/Missing Race	1.3	1.2	1.2	2.5	1.3	1.5
HH Income below 80,000	15.7	63.1	45.3	87.1	21.3	67.7
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.9	8.2	8.1	8.1	9.5	8.2
First Generation College	2.6	16.5	11.6	15.8	4.3	16.3
Attended Private HS	25.8	22.6	20.4	22.1	24.8	22.5
% FRPL of HS	21.8	29.9	31.4	28.7	23.7	29.7
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.7	12.7	7.6	7.6	11.8	11.8
USNA Legacy	5.2	2.4	1.4	0.6	4.5	2.0
SAT Math score	715.1	693.6	584.8	577.8	690.3	671.5
	[660.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 770.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
SAT Verbal score	714.4	694.6	599.6	587.1	692.5	674.1
	[670.0, 780.0]	[640.0, 760.0]	[550.0, 650.0]	[530.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	582.6	586.6	421.6	404.0	551.9	551.8
	[470.0, 694.0]	[487.0, 695.0]	[293.0, 584.0]	[287.0, 511.0]		
N	1,099	1,099	259	259	1,358	1,358

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 39 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 68: Class of 2024 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	66.0	61.2	38.2	42.3	61.2	58.0
African American	6.8	6.9	31.0	24.6	11.0	9.9
Hispanic	10.3	16.6	20.4	21.1	12.0	17.4
Asian American	13.1	12.0	6.3	8.9	11.9	11.5
Native American/Hawaiian	2.7	2.4	3.5	2.4	2.9	2.4
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	0.9	0.5	0.7	1.0	0.8
HH Income below 80,000	13.2	57.2	38.7	81.7	17.6	61.4
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	9.6	8.3	8.3	8.1	9.4	8.3
First Generation College	2.3	16.3	13.6	22.2	4.2	17.3
Attended Private HS	23.4	20.5	22.9	22.4	23.3	20.8
% FRPL of HS	22.9	30.3	30.7	30.6	24.2	30.3
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	14.7	14.7	8.6	8.6	13.6	13.6
USNA Legacy	6.0	3.6	1.6	1.7	5.3	3.2
SAT Math score	711.0	684.2	574.6	561.7	687.6	663.2
	[660.0, 770.0]	[620.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 600.0]		
SAT Verbal score	711.7	689.5	588.9	572.3	690.6	669.4
	[660.0, 770.0]	[630.0, 760.0]	[530.0, 640.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	584.8	578.8	420.5	411.4	556.6	550.1
	[476.0, 694.0]	[476.0, 694.0]	[296.0, 567.0]	[288.0, 546.0]		
N	1,173	1,173	243	243	1,416	1,416

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 40 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 69: Class of 2025 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
Variable	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	63.4	58.4	34.2	44.7	57.9	55.8
African American	5.8	5.7	31.8	21.3	10.7	8.6
Hispanic	11.4	16.4	21.4	22.0	13.3	17.5
Asian American	16.5	16.4	8.5	8.9	15.0	15.0
Native American/Hawaiian	1.8	1.9	3.5	2.2	2.1	2.0
Declined/Missing Race	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	14.6	62.6	34.8	80.5	18.4	65.9
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.3	9.2	9.2	9.2	10.1	9.2
First Generation College	2.7	11.6	6.7	8.5	3.4	11.0
Attended Private HS	23.3	21.1	20.4	20.3	22.7	20.9
% FRPL of HS	22.2	26.6	26.1	25.5	22.9	26.4
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	13.6	13.6	5.0	5.0	11.9	12.0
USNA Legacy	6.8	3.8	0.9	0.2	5.7	3.1
SAT Math score	684.1	663.1	566.9	578.4	662.0	647.1
	[640.0, 750.0]	[610.0, 740.0]	[520.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 640.0]		
SAT Verbal score	674.4	651.2	576.7	579.0	656.0	637.5
	[640.0, 730.0]	[610.0, 710.0]	[530.0, 630.0]	[530.0, 630.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	632.6	614.1	486.4	466.8	605.0	586.3
	[603.0, 714.0]	[562.0, 711.0]	[348.0, 644.0]	[342.0, 624.0]		
N	1,105	1,105	257	257	1,362	1,362

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 41 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Table 70: Class of 2026 Simulation 14—Simulation 7 + Increase Low SES applicant pool by 200%

Variable	USNA Non-Prep Admits		USNA Admits from Prep		Overall Admits	
	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated	Status Quo	Simulated
White	62.5	57.0	28.3	34.8	56.6	53.2
African American	7.0	8.4	36.6	31.0	12.2	12.3
Hispanic	10.5	15.3	19.1	18.9	12.0	15.9
Asian American	15.6	16.5	11.3	11.6	14.9	15.7
Native American/Hawaiian	2.5	1.4	4.0	3.3	2.7	1.7
Declined/Missing Race	1.9	1.4	0.7	0.4	1.7	1.2
HH Income below 80,000	15.1	67.8	40.3	81.3	19.5	70.2
Avg Zip Code Income (10,000 dollars)	10.0	8.8	9.3	9.2	9.9	8.9
First Generation College	3.2	19.8	15.7	23.8	5.4	20.5
Attended Private HS	21.8	20.2	21.3	21.1	21.7	20.3
% FRPL of HS	22.7	26.4	25.2	25.0	23.1	26.1
Blue Chip Athlete (Boutique Sports)	12.3	12.3	5.1	5.1	11.0	11.1
USNA Legacy	4.7	2.2	0.4	0.1	4.0	1.8
SAT Math score	686.1	654.1	564.5	567.7	665.0	639.1
	[640.0, 750.0]	[600.0, 710.0]	[520.0, 610.0]	[520.0, 610.0]		
SAT Verbal score	679.0	648.4	569.9	566.4	660.1	634.2
	[630.0, 730.0]	[600.0, 710.0]	[520.0, 620.0]	[520.0, 620.0]		
Standardized Rank in HS Class	637.3	598.6	444.9	421.5	604.0	568.0
	[618.0, 714.0]	[519.0, 707.0]	[314.0, 595.0]	[301.0, 555.0]		
N	1,155	1,155	242	242	1,397	1,397

Notes: Notes: 25th and 75th percentiles in brackets below select variables. This simulation repeats the exercise described in Table 42 and increases the Below-80k-income applicant pool to both USNA and NAPS by 200%, assuming the quality of the applicant pool remains the same.

Exhibit B

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
NORTHERN DIVISION

STUDENTS FOR FAIR ADMISSIONS

Plaintiff,

v.

THE UNITED STATES NAVAL
ACADEMY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 1:23-cv-2699-RDB

REBUTTAL EXPERT REPORT OF BRIGADIER GENERAL (RET) CHRISTOPHER S. WALKER

CONFIDENTIAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

i

CONFIDENTIAL

I.   Executive summary

USNA's experts rely on appeals to emotion that are not substantiated by data, and some of the evidence they do cite cuts *against* their positions. Culture is not the same as skin color, and combat effectiveness in the military most heavily depends on effective leadership. Based on my 40 years of experience in uniform, I am firmly convinced that competent and caring leadership is the way to service members' hearts and minds, regardless of one's race or ethnicity.

Indeed, the absence of evidence in USNA's expert reports is striking—not only because the data does not exist, but also because DoD has made little effort to find it even if it did. In a July 2023 congressional hearing, the Academy's Superintendent at the time, Vice Admiral Sean Buck, was asked by Congressman Mike Waltz whether he "[had] any empirical evidence" that units are "more combat ready or effective because of the diversity mix, because of the different mix of skin color" of their members. "VADM Buck was shielded from answering by the [Congressman's] time expiring," but "he did not attempt to refute Waltz's insinuation and did not answer the question later in the testimony or in public afterwards."[1]

The reports submitted by USNA in this case make clear why Admiral Buck did not answer—because the Academy has no evidence that racial balancing makes the military more lethal or effective. The Academy's failure to identify any compelling

---

[1] John Hughes, *West Point Data Chief Publicly Admits There is No Objective Evidence for Military DEI*, STARRS, (Oct. 6, 2023), https://perma.cc/WK44-TS9U.

CONFIDENTIAL

evidence here is not an outlier. The U.S. Military Academy at West Point's Chief Data Officer told the audience at its annual Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Conference in 2023—an audience that included Naval Academy personnel—that he had no data tying racial diversity levels to military success, either: "So as I thought about this, the theme of this presentation today, measuring success, I was scratching my and thinking, I don't have an answer. Just don't."[2]

Because it has no hard evidence, the Academy resorts to stereotyping by equating skin color with certain cultures, viewpoints, and experiences. For example, the Defendants imply that certain skin colors are force multipliers for the DoD due to their implied advantage when dealing with foreign allies. I argue that cultural awareness can be taught, and that any "inherent" advantage the U.S. gains from its personnel in this realm comes from servicemembers who were born and raised in the countries where the military happens to be operating at a given time—skin color is irrelevant.

Finally, if the USNA (or any other service academy) wants to achieve the moral objective of recruiting more skilled, motivated, and qualified career officers who represent diversity in its truest sense, then they should put in the work and create partnerships with primary and secondary school education programs in socioeconomically disadvantaged municipalities.

---

[2] John Hughes, *West Point Data Chief Publicly Admits There is No Objective Evidence for Military DEI*, STARRS, (Oct. 6, 2023), https://perma.cc/WK44-TS9U.

CONFIDENTIAL

II. USNA's experts' assertions about racial preferences and military effectiveness are unsupported, internally inconsistent, and largely based on stereotypes.

All of USNA's experts—and Dr. Haynie, Professor Lyall, and Ms. Truesdale in particular—offer broad and virtually boundless statements about the military value of diversity in the abstract.[3] Curiously, however, each limits their application of this principle to one of the least informative characteristics about human beings: skin color. More to the point, none of their reports offer any tangible evidence that the particular racial mix of a unit affects its chances of success in combat. Rather, Haynie, Lyall, and Truesdale all rely on flexibly applied assertions that cut in opposite directions when placed side by side. And in the end, each fall back on generalizations about the experiences, perspectives, and attitudes of members of various racial and ethnic groups.

A. USNA's experts' assertions are unsupported.

Many of USNA's experts' statements about mission accomplishment and racial balancing are either conclusory or self-referential. (Although these statements often invoke "diversity," they use the term in a racial context that can only refer to the racial balance or racial "representation" in a unit or branch of service.) For example, Ms. Truesdale's declaration speaks in authoritative tones about "military judgment[s] that a racially diverse officer corps is necessary for mission execution and maritime

---

[3] *See* Haynie Report 2-9 ("Diversity and inclusion support military effectiveness and mission accomplishment."); Truesdale Decl. ¶10 ("A diverse force is central to … mission effectiveness."); Lyall Report 4-7.

CONFIDENTIAL

dominance" without ever once explaining *why* or *how*.[4] Instead of providing these answers, Truesdale merely cites other recent Department of the Navy and DoD policy statements saying the same thing.[5]

When USNA's experts do cite independent evidence or "research," almost all of it comes from circumstances that are wholly different from military life in general, let alone combat. For example, Haynie cites a 2014 article from the Air & Space Power Journal to support her claim that "Diverse personnel create stronger teams and units, and those teams and units generate a more effective and mission successful enterprise."[6] Upon examination, however, the cited article itself admits that "[t]he military has no wide range studies that examine whether diverse teams solve complex problem sets better than nondiverse ones."[7] In recent testimony, Dr. Haynie was still unable to identify such a study.[8]

Similarly, Dr. Haynie claims that "RAND and outside research identifies how more diverse organizations (including military and law enforcement) directly impact operational effectiveness because such organizations 'are more effective at accomplishing their missions.'"[9] But the "RAND … research" Dr. Haynie quotes for this proposition is an article that "discuss[es] the scholarly literature on the efficacy of blinding

---

[4] Dkt. 46-4 ¶7.

[5] Dkt. 46-4 ¶¶8, 9, 10, 15, 17.

[6] Haynie Report ¶15.

[7] Col Suzanne M. Streeter, *The Air Force and Diversity: The Awkward Embrace*, Air & Space Power Journal (May-June 2014), https://perma.cc/B89C-NPYY.

[8] Haynie Dep. Tr. 106:9-19.

[9] Haynie Report ¶9 & n.8.

CONFIDENTIAL

strategies, how these insights apply in the context of DAF goals, other approaches that should be explored, and steps the DAF should take to better advance its goal of a more equitable and inclusive workforce."[10] The sentence fragment quoted by Dr. Haynie ("[r]esearch shows" that diverse organizations "are more effective at accomplishing their missions") does not cite any research at all.[11] The other RAND article Dr. Haynie cites for this claim is a "review" of "existing literature" that concedes "mixed results concerning the implications of diversity on team performance" (and, once again, points to other non-military studies for the literature in support of the affirmative case).[12]

The one USNA expert who does purport to offer evidence that "racial and ethnic diversity is an advantage in modern combat" is Professor Lyall.[13] But Lyall doesn't come close to proving such a link. Lyall's main thesis is that militaries with a greater degree of "military inequality" are more likely to suffer losses in combat and less likely to win on the battlefield. Military inequality, in turn, is "the degree to which a military draws on racial or ethnic groups that are subject to discrimination or repression" from the government.[14] Of course, there is no federal law or policy in the United States that sanctions racial or ethnic discrimination, and there hasn't been for decades. Lyall tries

---

[10] Dwayne M. Butler & Sarah W. Denton, RAND Corp., *How Effective are Blinding Concepts and Practices to Promote Equity in the Department of the Air Force?* 4 (Dec. 2021), https://bit.ly/3AaOCfj.
[11] Dwayne M. Butler & Sarah W. Denton, RAND Corp., *How Effective are Blinding Concepts and Practices to Promote Equity in the Department of the Air Force?* 4 (Dec. 2021), https://bit.ly/3AaOCfj; *see also* Paul J. Larkin, et al., *Military Necessity and Racial Discrimination*, Georgetown Journal of Law & Public Policy, Forthcoming, (April 30, 2024), http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4577628 (noting same).
[12] Slapakova et al., *Leveraging Diversity for Military Effectiveness*, 7 (2022).
[13] Lyall Report, 4.
[14] Lyall Report, 1.

CONFIDENTIAL

to evade this roadblock by claiming that "[m]ilitary inequality can also arise from *de facto* race- or ethnic-based discrimination" in addition to discrimination grounded in law.[15] According to Lyall, the United States is plagued with such discrimination to such an extent that "nearly 40 percent of the American population," a group that includes "all non-White racial groups in the US, [such as] Latinos, African Americans, Asian Americans, and American Indians," are "politically powerless."[16] This, he says, is "functionally equivalent to explicit discrimination by federal authorities."[17]

That claim is ludicrous on its face. There is no one who can convince me that I (as a Black American) have fewer rights or power than any other American. Lyall's reliance on this notion calls into question the assumptions upon which all of his other categorizations are based. Indeed, the "military inequality coefficient" that Lyall created to "measure the level of inequality among ethnic and racial groups within the military on the eve of war"—and that he subsequently uses to generate the data he cites—appears to stem from the same types of arbitrary inputs.[18] (Indeed, any categorization of ethnically diverse and "inclusive" armies that includes the Wehrmacht warrants a significant measure of skepticism for that reason alone.[19])

---

[15] Lyall Report, 2.
[16] Lyall Report, 18.
[17] Lyall Report, 18.
[18] Lyall Report, 8.
[19] *See* Lyall Report, 6, 16.

CONFIDENTIAL

The highly questionable premises of Lyall's conclusions aside, though, his conclusions themselves still have nothing to say about whether racial preferences at the U.S. Naval Academy make the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps more lethal. Lyall's assessment, in his own words, is focused on the outcomes "[w]hen prejudice becomes policy."[20] There is simply no analogue to these circumstances at the force wide level in the U.S. military in 2024. If certain policies are determined to have a different effect on some people more than others, it is up to the leadership to adjust. Lowering standards for a particular skin color is not the solution.

All of this highlights one final reason why Lyall's work is inapplicable. Because Lyall is battling a strawman of a draconian U.S. military that does not currently exist, he does not appear to feel any obligation to answer critical questions about how his research—even if accurate—would apply to the U.S. military in its current form in the modern era. He offers no limiting factor, no counterbalancing considerations against which the military must evaluate "inclusive" personnel policies placed before it. As I emphasized in my opening report, military service is not and cannot be for everyone. Whole categories of individuals—those who are too old, those who are overweight, and the ill or disabled, to name a few—are ineligible for service even though they comprise increasingly large segments of American society. Accordingly, military leadership makes

---

[20] Jason Lyall, *Divided Armies: Inequality and Battlefield Performance in Modern War*, Chapter 2, pg 46 (Princeton University Press 2020).

7

CONFIDENTIAL

balancing judgments when deciding personnel policy all the time. Lyall's prescription does away with all of that: it is a ratchet that operates in only one direction.

Finally, to the extent that any of Professor Lyall's opinions are based on his "qualitative assessments of … tactical and operational sophistication," as he has publicly described aspects of his work in *Divided Armies*,[21] it is unclear how he is qualified to make such assessments.

B.   USNA's experts' assertions are internally inconsistent.

At various points, USNA's experts also appear to argue against their own propositions without fully realizing it. While quoting the Congressional Research Service, Haynie notes that "task cohesion," which she defines as "a shared commitment to professional goals and experiences," is more important to military performance than "social cohesion" (which she defines as "the nature and quality of the emotional bonds of friendship, liking, caring, and closeness among group members").[22] The same CRS report claims "sameness" of people is less important than "the experiences that units share."[23] I have made a similar point in my initial report when I observed, based on 40 years of experience, that the "crucible" of a challenging basic training, strenuous follow-on training, realistic field exercises, and actual combat strengthens unit cohesion far more than skin color ever could.

---

[21] ISS Forum Roundtable XII-11, 30, https://perma.cc/NV8S-8SEV.
[22] Haynie Report. ¶10.
[23] Haynie Report. ¶10.

Similarly, Haynie suggests that "the degree to which excluded groups are perceived as competent and accepted within newly integrated teams is an important mediator for the relationship between diversity and unit cohesion."[24] I agree. In the military—and in combat arms occupations in particular—competence is the touchtone of trust and social acceptance. Haynie evidently fails to consider the real-world consequences of an openly acknowledged system of racial preferences like the one USNA is defending in this case or of such systems in general. If everyone knows that certain groups were awarded admission to a team or community under lower standards—and they eventually will know this is the case, either because they are directly aware of the Academy's policies or they witness its consequences—then perceptions of competence will be diminished. And trust and cohesion will be diminished along with them. Put differently, if the DoD lowers standards to admit certain minorities to the elite institutions, this will not be a policy that can be kept secret. Everyone will know, and the result (or second-order effect) will be the creation of another implied inequality that the DoD was trying to eliminate in the first place.

Many of Lyall's examples of "racially and ethnically" diverse armies also inadvertently highlight the nonsensical nature of USNA's racial categorizations (and the preferences based on them). Lyall's use of the combatants in the Second Congo War and the Ethiopia-Eritrea War to highlight the importance of diversity and inclusion—

---

[24] Haynie Report. ¶10.

despite all combatants having the same skin color—suggests a focus on diversity of cultures and viewpoints that USNA's single-minded focus on race does not capture. Lyall categorizes some of these armies as diverse and inclusive, and others less so, but USNA's blunt racial classifications would treat them as all the same. And, of course, the "French" and the "Poles, Germans, Italians, and Dutch" who fought alongside one another in "Napoleon's Grande Armee" would all simply be considered "white" if they applied to the Naval Academy today.[25] Thus, if anything, it is USNA's racial categorizations that ignore individuality and treat individuals as "faceless and uniform."[26]

Finally, Dr. Haynie argues that racially balanced units are critical to "enhanced cooperation, trust, and understanding of the operational environment overseas."[27] As support, Haynie emphasizes that "[t]he DoD's Pacific, European, and Central combatant commands assessed themselves as either 'generally inadequate' or 'inadequate' in 'knowledge of societal, cultural, tribal structure, infrastructure, [and] evolving threats' in their areas of responsibility."[28] For starters, the evidentiary value of cultural competency self-assessments from three of DoD's eleven combatant commands *in 2004* (context Haynie does not provide) is unclear.[29] More importantly, it is impossible to

---

[25] Lyall Report 6.

[26] Lyall Report, 5.

[27] Haynie Report ¶20.

[28] Haynie Report ¶20.

[29] *See* Haynie Report ¶20 (quoting William Wunderle, *Through the Lens of Cultural Awareness: A Primer for US Armed Forces Deploying to Arab and Middle Eastern Countries* (Combat Studies Institute Press 2006)); Wunderle at 4 n.11 (providing examples of combatant command cultural competency assessments from Defense Science Board 2004 Summer Study, *Transition To and From Hostilities*, (Sept. 2004)).

reconcile the claim that race is a proxy for cultural awareness with the DoD's assessment that U.S. forces lacked cultural competency in *Europe*—a region where many white officers doubtlessly have ancestry. It seems far more likely, as I argue below, that cultural awareness is not linked to skin color and is instead something that can be taught and trained.

C. USNA's experts' explanations for the benefits of diversity are grounded in shallow stereotypes.

Many of the arguments advanced by USNA's experts appear to be traceable to an underlying attitude that certain traits, beliefs, or comradery are shared among people based on skin color. For example, Lyall argues that "diverse teams typically outperform homogenous groups,"[30] and Haynie likewise warns against the dangers of "a more homogenous DoD."[31] I would argue "Homogeneity" is not inherent in race. Homogeneity may be more prevalent in the same culture but race itself is not a determining factor. Haynie and Lyall's arguments imply that all White people think alike. As anyone who has traveled the United States can attest, White people from the Hamptons are much different from White people from Appalachia, who are much different from White people from San Francisco, who are much different from White people from El Paso. All Black people do not think alike, either.

Yet Haynie repeats this mistake elsewhere in her report. In paragraph 14, for instance she argues that without racial diversity, the DoD will be left with leaders of

---

[30] Lyall Report, 6.
[31] Haynie Report ¶15.

11

"similar backgrounds, talents, and perspectives."[32] Truesdale, too, emphasizes "diversity of talent" while quoting Secretary of the Navy Carlos Del Toro.[33] What makes skin color a determinant of talent? USNA's experts do not say. The notion that different races have different talents could not be more at odds with the ethos of the American military.

On March 23, 2023, I sat in the office of the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary (PDAS) of the Air Force, Manpower and Reserve Affairs to watch the House Armed Services Committee featuring Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness Gilbert Cisneros, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs Agnes Schaefer, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs Franklin Parker, and Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower and Reserve Affairs Alex Wagner speak about race and promotions. They were asked by Rep. Jim Banks whether they would "commit to opposing any effort to promote or recruit servicemembers based on their race or gender." Mr. Wagner replied, "Mr. Chairman, I believe that promoting solely based on race or gender is inimical to our values as a service."[34]

Quoting William D. Wunderle, Haynie also writes at length about "cultural awareness." From my experience, especially during my many long deployments in different parts of the world, cultural awareness is something that can be taught and trained.

---

[32] Haynie Report ¶14.
[33] Dkt. 46-4, ¶10.
[34] U.S. Navy Press Office, *House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel Holds Hearing on DoD Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion*, (Mar. 23, 2023), https://perma.cc/93N2-ZAAR.

Those of us who served in Baghdad with the Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA) learned quickly that respecting cultural norms in Iraq bore more fruit and increased our chances of living. Race mattered very little in Baghdad and the rest of Iraq.

As one example of where diversity has proven benefits, Haynie identifies a U.S. Army Captain, who was born in Haiti and deployed to Haiti in 2021 to assist in post-earthquake relief efforts. His "language proficiency and cultural awareness facilitated coordination with Haitian partners."[35] But the correlation Haynie is implying based on race is not true. The reason that Captain was successful in facilitating coordination was because he was Haitian. Not because he was Black. I (and most every other Black American service member who is not Haitian and fluent specifically in Haitian Creole) would be just as lost as the White service members if I were sent to Haiti. As a matter of fact, I would argue that even Black Americans who have studied French and are classified by the DoD as having reached the highest levels of native-speaker proficiency in that language would be lost because the Haitian dialect is wholly unique. USNA is not extending preferences in admissions to Americans who were born and raised in Haiti, Nigeria, Ghana, Togo, Rwanda, Somalia, Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Ethiopia, etc. They are giving preferences for skin color. Thus, Haynie's example is irrelevant.

The notion that skin color is a shortcut for cultural connections in African countries is similarly based on the crudest of stereotypes. There is a word that originated in

---

[35] Haynie Report ¶20.

Nigeria but has spread across Western Africa. The word is "akata." In everyday speech, the word would mean "foreigner." But there is another more derogatory context to the word reserved specifically for Black Americans (and even Native West Africans who spent too much time in the United States, allegedly losing their home culture). When the word is used to describe Black Americans, it goes back to the alleged exact translation of "cotton picker." I have witnessed this word causing fights between Black Americans and people from Nigeria or Ghana. There is another word used by Nigerians to describe White people. I have seen it spelled both "oyinbo" and "oyibo." But modern Nigerians also use it to describe Black Americans, and many families discourage their sons and daughters from marrying the "oyibo" Black Americans. The culture is the divide. Finally, when I was deployed to Kenya, flying relief supplies into Somalia, I learned that the Swahili word for White person is Mzungu. A good friend of mine (DC Cochran, a lighted skinned Black American who is now a Brigadier General in the Air Force and married to a Kenyan woman) and I made tremendous efforts to bond with and relate to the Kenyan workers who were employed at the hotel we made our base of operations (The White Sands). We eventually developed a rapport with the workers, and we learned their names, and learned about their families. Even though we were extremely friendly with each other, DC and I got nicknames from the workers. I was known as K'zungu, and DC was known as K'hindi (due to his light skin and wavy hair). It was somewhat of a joking moniker, but they explained that we still were not Kenyan, and our mannerisms were more "White" in their cultural view. The notion that I would

14

have an advantage over my white and Hispanic counterparts in these countries solely because of my skin color is ridiculous.

Similarly, I grew up with a Jamaican mother and father. Almost every summer during my childhood, I would be flown down to Jamaica to spend the summers with my grandparents, aunts, uncles, and cousins. As a child, I had a reasonably thick Jamaican accent, and I would be teased at school because of it. But as thick as my accent was, when I went to Jamaica, my cousins and their friends would tease me and call me a "Yankee," because they could hear an American accent. Even now, my Jamaican accent returns when I visit Jamaica, but I am still treated like a "Yankee" tourist as soon as I open my mouth. In short, even in a country where I still have extensive family, and my accent, understanding of the culture, and familiarity with the terrain are far greater than those of most Americans, my presence still wouldn't be a "trump card" in international relations with the military of that country.

The international relations argument for racial balancing is remarkably thin as well. Niger, Mali, and Burkina Faso recently formed a new alliance called the Alliance of Sahel States (AES). These countries rebuffed the U.S.-allied Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). Only a few weeks ago, U.S. forces announced that they were leaving Niger because they were being effectively expelled by their hosts. I know for a fact that the United States had a reasonably racially diverse group of service members deployed there, because some of my troops and many troops from other units I know were sent there. The AES is now embracing Russian military advisors. One does

15

not need an expensive study to know that the Russian military does not have significant

numbers of Black soldiers participating in their endeavors. In much the same way,

China and the People's Liberation Army are expanding their reach across Africa and in

South America. Again, I am reasonably certain the PLA is not widely populated with

Black or Hispanic soldiers, airmen, or sailors.

III.   USNA's experts improperly recast political judgments about racial balancing as military conclusions.

As I noted in my opening report, there is no "military consensus" that racial

balancing—or the racial preferences used to achieve that result—is necessary. There

certainly has not been a "consistent[] … conclusion" for the past eight decades that

these things are necessary.[36] In support of this mischaracterization, Dr. Haynie cites

President Truman's Executive Order 9981 establishing the Fahy Committee to begin

the process of desegregation.[37] She likewise cites President John F. Kennedy's 1962

order establishing the Gesell Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces,[38]

and the 1971 establishment of the DoD Defense Race Relations Institute for the same

proposition.[39] None of those historical facts supports the conclusion that DoD has

always believed that it should use racial preferences and lower standards. To the con-

trary, those directives had a common, unmistakable theme: that DoD should eliminate

---

[36] Haynie Report ¶24.
[37] Haynie Report ¶24.
[38] Haynie Report ¶25.
[39] Haynie Report ¶26.

CONFIDENTIAL

toxic leaders and ensure that everyone is treated *equally*, regardless of race, color, or ethnicity.

And although USNA's experts repeatedly cite the Military Leadership Diversity Commission, the conclusions in the Commission's report were politically motivated and not based on actual observations of leadership in battle. The MLDC was the creation of senior members of the Congressional Black Caucus, who established it via an amendment to the version of the 2009 National Defense Authorization Act passed by the House of Representatives.[40] The version of the 2009 NDAA passed by the Senate "did not contain a provision to create the MLDC," but the section in the House bill creating the Commission was included in the final version of the law through the reconciliation process.[41] Neither the House nor the Senate held any debate about the MLDC or the scope of its assignment.

According to the MLDC itself, "[t]he underlying motivation" for its work "can be found" in "a press release in which Congressmen James Clyburn (D–S.C.), Kendrick Meek (D–Fla.), Elijah Cummings (D–Md., and Hank Johnson (D-Ga) explained their thinking on the matter."[42] In the press release, Rep. Clyburn stated: "Just as our military looks like America, so too must our general officers. If minorities are asked to go into

---

[40] Military Leadership Diversity Commission, Issue Paper #9, *How Did the Military Leadership Diversity Commission Come About?*, 1 (Jan. 2010)., https://perma.cc/2JAE-LV4X.

[41] Military Leadership Diversity Commission, Issue Paper #9, *How Did the Military Leadership Diversity Commission Come About?*, 2 (Jan. 2010)., https://perma.cc/2JAE-LV4X.

[42] Military Leadership Diversity Commission, Issue Paper #9, *How Did the Military Leadership Diversity Commission Come About?*, 1 (Jan. 2010)., https://perma.cc/2JAE-LV4X.

harms [sic] way, they must be allowed to lead as well. A military that is proportionally

representative of all races, cultures, and ethnicities increases the readiness and efficiency

of our fighting forces."[43] Rep. Cummings similarly stated: "These measures are critical

in enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of the U.S. armed forces by addressing the

under-representation of women and ethnic minorities and creating a diverse military

that fully represents our nation's citizens."[44] If these statements seem familiar, that's

because the Commission's ultimate conclusions mirrored them almost word for word.

Since then, they have been characterized by advocates of racial balancing—including

the Academy's experts in this case—as considered military judgments, even though they

have no basis in evidence.

The Commission's conclusions certainly were not based on history or tradition

of military culture, either. Consider the following statement from the MLDC's final

report, where the Commission announces a "new" approach to racial diversity:

> Diversity management calls for creating a culture of inclusion in which the
> diversity of knowledge and perspectives that members of different groups
> bring to the organization shapes how the work is done. Creating this cul-
> ture will involve changing the way in which people relate to one another
> within a single unit, within a particular military branch, and throughout
> DoD. In particular, although good diversity management rests on a foun-
> dation of fair treatment, it is not about treating everyone the same. This
> can be a difficult concept to grasp, especially for leaders who grew up with
> the EO-inspired mandate to be both color and gender blind. Blindness to
> difference, however, can lead to a culture of assimilation in which

---

[43] Military Leadership Diversity Commission, Issue Paper #9, *How Did the Military Leadership Diversity Commission Come About?*, 1 (Jan. 2010)., https://perma.cc/2JAE-LV4X.
[44] Military Leadership Diversity Commission, Issue Paper #9, *How Did the Military Leadership Diversity Commission Come About?*, 2 (Jan. 2010)., https://perma.cc/2JAE-LV4X.

CONFIDENTIAL

differences are suppressed rather than leveraged. Cultural assimilation, a key to military effectiveness in the past, will be challenged as inclusion becomes, and needs to become, the norm.[45]

Now compare the Commission's language with the 2019 testimony of the now-former

Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General John E. Hyten:

> And when I came into the military, I came in from Alabama … and racism was a huge problem in the military … but I watched commander after commander after commander take charge, own that, and anytime they saw it, eliminated it from the formation. When that happens, a huge improvement happens. Now when I am in uniform, I feel colorblind, which is amazing.[46]

IV.   Conclusion

I am not aware of any veteran or active service member who has seen combat

who, if asked whether their respect for their leadership came from character or skin

color, would say the latter. From my experience, subordinate troops group their com-

manders and leaders into three main categories, (1) inspirational, (2) adequate (let's sur-

vive until this commander rotates to a new post), and (3) terrible (a complete joke and

a liability). If skin color is a consideration in the beginning, tactical and technical com-

petence will always overtake it. It is insulting, patronizing, and racist to argue that

Blacks, Hispanics, and other groups cannot discern good leadership from bad and will

be more likely to gravitate toward skin color than merit. The perspectives of Black sail-

ors during World War II are instructive. Many of these sailors were picked to become

---

[45] USNA-00011644.

[46] United States Senate Committee on Armed Services, *Hearing to Consider the Nomination of General John E. Hyten. USAF For Reappointment to the Grade of General and to Be Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff,* Tr. 32:12-19 (July 30, 2019).

19

CONFIDENTIAL

the first Black Naval Officers in United States history. They all had the same skin color, but their perspectives varied wildly.

In their initial training, some "experienced little prejudice during their first few weeks, but that was not true for every new black recruit. Much depended on the white officers they encountered during training. Some were outstanding leaders, while others were low-class bigots."[47] Some, like Lieutenant Commander Daniel Armstrong, "a forty-nine-year-old graduate of the US Naval Academy at Annapolis," came across as condescending and paternalistic:

> Black men's perception of Armstrong depended, in part, on where they came from. Men from the South typically found him to be fair and open-minded, while many from the North, as well as better-educated Southerners, generally resented what they saw as his condescending paternalism. [One sailor] was in the latter group, describing Armstrong as a "great white father," the kind of officer who assumed he understood how black men thought because he had grown up around them. [A second] felt that Armstrong was susceptible to some of the most "pathetic stereotypes" of the South and that he could never see black men as anything more than cooks or servants. "He was definitely the wrong man for the job he was assigned," [the second sailor] said. Armstrong encouraged black men to be proud of their race and heritage and insisted that everyone at Camp Robert Smalls observe Negro History Week on February 7. As part of those festivities, he had recruits prepare an extensive exhibition of paintings, photographs, and historical documents showing the achievements and contributions that African Americans had made in art, sciences, industry, education, business, athletics, literature, and music. He asked Owen Dodson, a seaman second class who had graduated from the Yale School of Drama, to produce plays about famous African Americans, naval histories, and wartime allies, in an effort to boost morale. …

---

[47] Dan Goldberg, *The Golden Thirteen: How Black Men Won the Right to Wear Navy Gold*, 97 (Beacon Press, 2020).

But many black men bristled at Armstrong's efforts to promote black culture. He commissioned a new marching song composed specifically for black enlistees: "They look like men, they act like men; I think they will be great men of war." Some from the South believed the song represented progress, while many from the North refused to sing along, rejecting the notion that they were "like men." How ridiculous they thought. We aren't "like men." We are men.[48]

I submit that those who advocate for racial preferences are using these very same tactics today. A culture of "dignity" and "respect" is admirable, and with good leadership, one should have no problem flourishing. But a "culture of equity"? What does that mean? What message does that send to minority applicants and their future classmates? Are minorities less intelligent and more in need of a handout? Or do they have the same potential (if given the same educational opportunities/power supply) to compete like everyone else? USNA's focus is misplaced. It is obvious that the current political leadership in DoD views racial balancing as more of a moral or ideological imperative than as a strategic imperative. But if they are so concerned about skin color representation at USNA and in the officer corps, then they should concentrate their fires on reaching out to socioeconomically disadvantaged municipalities and communities and making attendance at the Naval Academy something to be earned, not given. I guarantee there are plenty of talented future officers out there, if the Academy is willing to look for them.

---

[48] Dan Goldberg, *The Golden Thirteen: How Black Men Won the Right to Wear Navy Gold*, 98-99 (Beacon Press, 2020).

CONFIDENTIAL

Dated: July 31, 2024   /s/ Brig. Gen. (Ret.) Christopher S. Walker, USAF (Ret)

Brig. Gen. (Ret.) Christopher S. Walker, USAF (Ret)

CONFIDENTIAL

APPENDIX: ADDITIONAL SOURCES AND MATERIALS CONSIDERED

In addition to the literature cited in the body of this report and the documents referenced in Appendix B of my opening report, I considered the following sources while formulating this rebuttal report:

- Dkt. 46-4 Truesdale Declaration

- Expert Report of Jason Lyall

- Expert Report of Beth Bailey

- Rule 26(a)(2)(c) disclosures of Jeannette Haynie

- Rule 26(a)(2)(c) disclosures of Stephanie Miller

- Rule 26(a)(2)(c) disclosures of Lieutenant Colonel Katherine Batterton

- Rule 26(a)(2)(c) disclosures of John Sherwood

- Rule 26(a)(2)(c) disclosures of Lisa Truesdale

- Equity and Equality – USNA-00028544

- Summary Assessment of Midshipmen Equity by Race/Ethnic Group – USNA-00028834

- Lubinski, et al, *Intellectual Precocity: What Have We Learned Since Terman?*, Gifted Children Quarterly (July 28, 2020)

- Transcript of Deposition of Jeannette Haynie

23

Exhibit C

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
NORTHERN DIVISION

STUDENTS FOR FAIR ADMISSIONS *Plaintiff*, v. THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY, *et al.*, *Defendants*.	No. 1:23-cv-2699-RDB

REBUTTAL EXPERT REPORT OF DAKOTA L. WOOD

CONFIDENTIAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONFIDENTIAL

I.   Executive summary

The U.S. Naval Academy's experts argue that the racial composition of the U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine Corps is so important to their effectiveness and legitimacy that the race of applicants should be a basis weighing in favor of their admission to the Naval Academy. I disagree. Improved test scores, physical fitness standards, after-school jobs, and volunteer activities are available to all, but a prospective officer cannot change their race by working harder, becoming stronger, or studying more intently. Emphasizing the race of an applicant implies that racial factors are so important that they outweigh whatever negative effects racial preference might have in an officer's career, on unit cohesion and identity, and on overall force effectiveness in war.

The Naval Academy's experts go to great lengths trying to justify the use of race by claiming the racial composition of military forces is an essential factor affecting their performance in war. But they are wrong in their assessments, arguments, and—shockingly—their apparent understanding of military affairs, key aspects of military units, and the realities of conditions in zones of crisis, both on land and at sea.

The Academy's experts refer to historical evidence whereby tensions and conflict within populations from which militaries have drawn their manpower propagate within the military itself. Historically, such prejudices have focused on race, ethnicity, religious beliefs, tribal identity, nationality, or simple competition between groups over resources. As shown by a few of the Academy's experts—Lyall, Sherwood, and Bailey— abusive treatment of disfavored groups results in terrible morale, poor unit cohesion,

abysmal battlefield performance, desertion, resistance to authority, low retention and recruitment, and tragic combat losses. This should not surprise anyone.

But what the overwhelming historical evidence really shows is the simplest truth: when you treat people badly, you get bad results. The corollary to this is: when you treat people fairly, you get good results.

These truths raise what should be an obvious question: are servicemembers in today's military treated badly or fairly? In other words, is the *current* military served by good leaders and policies or is it not much different than the military of the past that suffered from racial prejudice and mistreatment of its people?

Obviously, the U.S. military has had dark periods when minorities were treated badly. As noted, the military is an extension of society. If there are deep problems in society, expect to see them in the military. But conditions can be changed, as more recent history has proved. Whereas racial minorities were prevented from rank, responsibility, and recognition in the past, in today's military everyone has equal opportunity across all aspects of military service, and this has been the case for a half-century. Just as we no longer need to mobilize the National Guard to ensure children of different races can safely attend public schools, the measures needed to fix racial discrimination in the U.S. military have accomplished their purpose. Indeed, the only sanctioned unequal treatment of Navy servicepeople by race is the very practice challenged in this case:

the use of race as a basis for admission to the Academy.[1] Continuing such unequal treatment exacerbates, rather than addresses, concerns about inequality and unfair treatment within the ranks.

In sum, today's military is not its ancestor. Today's "small unit leaders" do not reflect their predecessors who condoned and legitimized prejudicial conduct. The Academy's experts miss this point entirely. Instead, they contend that the use of race is needed to advance proportional representation of race within the officer corps, for the following misguided reasons:

Improved effectiveness in serving the nation and contributing to national security. Counter to the Academy's argument, the history of warfare proves that combat effectiveness is a result of cohesion; team identity; trust; leadership; and hard, relevant, and realistic training. Cohesion, trust, and the like result from everyone on a team meeting and adhering to standards, demonstrating competence, observing and experiencing fairness in rewards and discipline, and believing that there are common expectations and demands for everyone *without* favoritism or prejudice. Any policies, behaviors, or actions that show favoritism, or that are perceived as showing favoritism, breed friction,

---

[1] One of the Academy's expert witnesses, Ms. Lisa Truesdale, is "expected to testify that the Navy and Marine Corps are generally prohibited from considering race and ethnicity after the initial accession stage, making the limited consideration of race by the United States Naval Academy particularly important in creating a racially diverse officer corps." Truesdale Disclosure, p. 3. This should raise the key question: why are the Navy and Marine Corps prohibited from using race as a criterion for anything related to service members? I assume it is because various laws have been implemented that prohibit discrimination (that would include preferential treatment) based on race, creed, color, religion, sex, and so forth. If the military services are prohibited from using race in personnel matters, why should the Academy be allowed to make decisions based on race?

CONFIDENTIAL

resentment, and division because they violate fairness and common standards—i.e., they essentially pit one group against another. This harms unit effectiveness that, in turn, harms morale and leads to poor performance, which generates negative perceptions, which, in turn, harms retention and poisons the view of outsiders that the unit is credible and legitimate. These outcomes are the opposite of what the Academy says it is trying to achieve.

Improved recruiting and retention. High standards are essential to high performance. High performance leads to success. Success attracts people who want to be part of a winning team. No one aspires to join a mediocre team. They are motivated by the challenge of proving that they have what it takes to be among the best. It is important to note that the best performing teams only remain so by keeping their standards high. Once standards are lowered to accommodate those who want to be a member, but who do not meet the standard, then the team slips into mediocrity.

The Academy's experts argue that making allowances for shortfalls in merit, to gain the objective of an arbitrary level of racial representation, is worth it because race is more important than both the reality and the perception of team members that performance standards matter. Perhaps the Academy believes that racial composition itself compensates for shortfalls in capability and performance and that adding a teammate who performs less than "standard" nevertheless makes the team more effective because the person is of a desired race. I am unaware of any data that proves racial identity

4

supplants demonstrated performance in achieving greater mission effectiveness. Why would anyone want to join a team that continues to emphasize identity over standards?

If the services' objective is to recruit and retain the nation's "best and brightest," they should place their priorities on setting high standards and enforcing adherence to such for all team members regardless of race.

Improved legitimacy. A military is legitimate if it is seen as competent and effective in operations, treats its people fairly, and has the interests of its country at heart rather than its own. Treating people fairly includes the absence of prejudice but also the absence of favoritism. If everyone has equal opportunity to join and to compete for position, rank, reward, and so forth—the operative word is *equal*, meaning without bias or unfair advantage—the number of men, women, and racial group representation will fall out as they do, based on who meets and competitively exceeds standards and who falls short. If everyone knows the process is fair, there is no legitimate basis for complaint. To the extent the military adjusts standards to favor preferred outcomes, the process is no longer fair and the military's reputation is damaged.

Internationally, a military's reputation among friends and foes comes directly from its performance: the force (unit, crew, individual) is either professional and effective or it isn't. No one cares about its racial composition, whether the force mirrors its larger society or whether the composition of the force relates in any way to a partner force (and certainly not to an enemy). For example, Taiwan and America's NATO allies

care whether the U.S. military is able to help if conflict erupts. The racial composition of the force is rightly irrelevant.

A variety of lived-experiences or race/ethnicity-derived community/cultural perspectives may matter in advertising campaigns or customer outreach in the commercial sector, but they have no bearing on delivering close air support, emplacement of automatic weapons, responding to an ambush or attacking an enemy strongpoint, hunting an enemy submarine, conducting resupply operations on land or at sea, launching a missile strike or defending against one, or even in developing a campaign plan that orchestrates sequential and parallel operations to accomplish war objectives. They have no bearing on embassy reinforcement operations or the evacuation of civilians and diplomatic personnel from a zone of conflict.

In practical terms, the military realities of war do not tolerate the preferred theories of Western academia.

In short, the demographic profile of the force is irrelevant to its operational effectiveness when engaged in war, which is the ultimate value and purpose of any military organization. On very rare occasions, specific types of people are assembled for specific missions: for example, all-female teams were assembled to interact with and/or interrogate Muslim women in Afghanistan and Iraq. Sometimes, intelligence or special operations missions work best when surface characteristics (skin color, hair color, body type) enable an American to be less noticeable moving within a foreign population. But overall racial composition has no explicit value itself because there is no direct link

between race—e.g., a force having a percentage of Hispanics or having a Hispanic as-signed to a specific billet—and mission outcomes.

Further, with very rare exceptions, there isn't any relevant racial or ethnic con-nection between an American and the locals of whatever country the U.S. military is working with. Someone from Congo, Zimbabwe, Tajikistan, or Uruguay would not view an American (regardless of skin color) as familiar or connected. The foreign ser-vicemember and his/her American counterpart will have grown up in profoundly dif-ferent contexts. The military forces of other countries want to work with the United States, or they fear the United States, because American forces have great equipment, lots of money, some of the best training, and are able to call upon resources almost unimaginable by less capable countries. The racial composition of American units does not make it easier for foreign militaries to relate to Americans.

The Naval Academy's argument about the racial composition of a unit and pro-portional representation between officer and enlisted ranks is unworkable in a mathe-matical sense and in practical terms in managing personnel assignments. Achieving a particular percentage of the officer corps in racial composition for the force as a whole doesn't mean the ratio can be achieved on each ship, naval station, or shore command. If racial composition and officer/enlisted proportionality is directly related to team ef-fectiveness, then ship A having such a composition would be measurably better than ship B without the same composition. But it doesn't work like that. One ship may have 15 percent minority officers and another none. Do the Academy's experts argue that

ship A is demonstrably better than ship B? Officers and crew are routinely rotated from one assignment to another, subject to the needs of the Navy or Marine Corps. Wouldn't the fluctuation of ratios and proportions have varying effects on the cohesion of affected teams? Or does the Academy contend that a specific ratio of minorities that roughly mirrors that of the general population, distributed in varying concentrations across the military services, still has the desired effect of reassuring people that they are in a safe and supportive place?

If the Academy's objective is to graduate x-number of minorities to achieve a desired representation of young officers in the service, and weights race as a factor to achieve a certain level of representation in the entering class, why does the Academy not continue that preferential treatment in grading, assignments, and promotions? Why is a racial preference okay at the beginning of a career and not throughout it if the objective is to have a force with a certain racial composition at all ranks? And how can we believe that the Academy's use of race is critical when it produces only 1 out of every 5 new Navy officers?[2]

---

[2] U.S. Navy Recruiting Command (NRC) is responsible for accessing officers for the U.S. Navy's Officer Candidate School, Officer Indoctrination School, and Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps. It does not recruit candidates for the U.S. Naval Academy. In 2024, NRC accessed 2871 new officers; the U.S. Naval Academy graduated and commissioned 760 ensigns. Combined, NRC and USNA produced 3631 ensigns, meaning the Academy accounted for 20.9 percent, or 1 out of every 5 new officers. See "Navy Recruiting Facts and Statistics," Navy Recruiting Command, https://www.cnrc.navy.mil/About/Navy-Recruiting-Facts-and-Statistics/, and "News Release: Graduation - Class of 2024," U.S. Naval Academy, https://www.usna.edu/News-Center/2024/05/Class_of_2024_Stats_final.pdf.

CONFIDENTIAL

Indeed, the Academy's experts' arguments for racial representation can easily be applied to gender. According to the U.S. Census Bureau's 2020 survey of America, the U.S. population is 50.9 percent female.[3] Why doesn't the Academy, or the naval services, seek to increase female representation to achieve the same gender representation? Is racial identity more important to combat effectiveness than gender?[4]

Moreover, there are very clear potential harms extending from the Academy's propositions. They include:

- To the extent that servicemembers believe that bias, favoritism, or other forms of unfair practices affect policies, leader decisions, selection, promotion, awards, or any other thing that affects their circumstances, they lose trust in "the system" and conclude they can't get a "fair deal" regardless of how hard they work. When they have a better record than someone else, but the other person is selected because of race, they will become resentful, distrustful, and bitter.

- Uneven treatment of people leads to division. It corrodes a sense of team unity. It damages the idea that there is a common standard, that everyone is measured against that standard, and that you either meet/exceed that standard or you don't.

- Favoring one person or group over another because of race or ethnicity gives the favored person an advantage that someone not in that group cannot over-come. It breeds a sense that it doesn't matter how talented or good one is in the things that matter to combat effectiveness—the skills, education, experience, etc.—the "other guy" with the desired race will get the reward. This

---

[3] United States Census Bureau, Census Bureau Releases New 2020 Census Data on Age, Sex, Race, Hispanic Origin, Households and Housing, (May 25, 2023), https://perma.cc/Z3J4-FC9W.

[4] Interestingly, women comprise 49.77 percent of global population and are generally held to be most affected by the ravages of conflict. If the Academy argues that the demographic composition of naval forces matters to its effectiveness in relating to foreign populations, this would be another reason for the Academy to set sex/gender as a criterion in its accessions process. See United States Census Bureau, International Database – Population Pyramid, July 28, 2024. https://www.census.gov/data-tools/demo/idb/#/dashboard?COUNTRY_YEAR=2024&COUNTRY_YR_ANIM=2024&menu=countryViz&CCODE_SINGLE=**&quickReports=OVW.

CONFIDENTIAL

destroys all of the aspects of effectiveness that the Academy says it values and that are important to national security: team coherence, trust, mutual good will, and confidence that each has "earned their spurs" and respect.

All of the Academy's arguments are inherently flawed or are based on flawed presumptions, which are echoed in the expert opinions assembled by the Academy to support its position.

II. Sherwood and Bailey's historical analyses are incomplete and irrelevant to the all-volunteer military of the 21st Century.

Dr. Sherwood and Dr. Bailey both heavily emphasize historical examples of racial discrimination in the military and imply—or outright claim—that such examples will reemerge if the Academy ceases to consider race in admissions. Not coincidentally, both experts also omit crucial historical context and ignore fundamental differences between today's military and the Vietnam-era military.

Sherwood. Sherwood[5] provides a historical overview of racial issues in the U.S. military during the 19th and 20th centuries. Sherwood's declaration is an interesting read, but it is also irrelevant to the argument that racial considerations in today's military are important (much less imperative) to the country's security.

Sherwood's own report demonstrates that treating people badly leads to trouble. When marginalized and disfavored groups are added to a military, and they continue to be mistreated, the force suffers problems. When the groups are not mistreated, the force

---

[5] The report simply incorporates by reference Dr. Sherwood's declaration to this Court. See Sherwood Report, 1. Thus, all future citations will be to paragraphs from Sherwood's declaration. See Dkt. 46-7.

benefits. This is not because the force is diverse; it is because the evils that accompany abusive treatment don't exist in the force and the military force gains the benefit of good morale and motivation and the productive contributions of more people. Any group that is treated fairly, provided good leadership, is well supplied, and has a defined purpose will do good work regardless of its racial or ethnic composition. This is what history shows, both in the record assembled by Sherwood and in my own experience serving in and studying the military.

Group dynamics in military forces typically reflect what is occurring in general society. But military forces can be better or worse than society because of their comparatively closed system, wherein leadership can adopt and enforce policies that lead to people being treated better or worse than in the larger society. This is an essential aspect of leadership. Poor leaders produce poor results; good leaders produce the opposite. When leaders differentiate their subordinates according to race, or any other characteristic, they create conditions that make it harder to build teams and to generate effective military power.

Sherwood cites Roosevelt's EO 8802 "'affirming the policy of full participation in the defense program regardless of color, race, creed, and national origin' and directing the armed forces to 'lead the war in erasing discrimination over color or race.'"[6] Sherwood's citation of Roosevelt is fascinating, considering that the Academy's admissions

---

[6] Dkt. 46-7, ¶23.

11

CONFIDENTIAL

policies *contravene* Roosevelt's directions. The President intended for the U.S. military to erase discrimination; the text of the policy reveals a desire that race would no longer be a factor in any aspect of military service. Yet the Naval Academy continues to believe that race *is* a factor and, through its admissions policy, intends to sustain it in perpetuity.

The whole of Sherwood's declaration is a historical record of the bad things that result when people are treated unequally. The importance of equal treatment is revealed by Sherwood himself in paragraphs 64 and 65 of his declaration. In paragraph 64, he states: "Once at USNA, these classes [of 1980-99] discovered a relatively integrated school and did not experience the racism and ostracism early Black midshipmen had endured."[7] In paragraph 65, Sherwood states: "By the end of the twentieth century, the USNA had emerged as what Schneller calls an 'unparalleled opportunity for black men and women.'"[8] He further argues that "the last vestiges of conscious institutional dis-crimination" were "purged from Naval Academy in 1976."[9] Finally, Sherwood observes that "African Americans in the classes of 1980-99 remained fully integrated into brigade life and enjoyed equal access to Academy opportunities."[10]

Sherwood errs a few paragraphs later, however, by assuming that correlation equals causation: "[It] is not coincidental that the increase in Black USNA graduates corresponds with the decrease in racial incidents experienced in the Navy and Marine

---

[7] Dkt. 46-7, ¶64.
[8] Dkt. 46-7, ¶65.
[9] Dkt. 46-7, ¶65.
[10] Dkt. 46-7, ¶65.

Corps. The more Black midshipman perceive the Navy and Marine Corps as treating them fairly—including through the presence of Black officers—the less likely it is that racial tensions will exist."[11] It is far more likely that the decrease in racial tensions has been the result of simply treating people better—which stems from the change in attitudes, values, and perspectives that has occurred across society and throughout the military over the past half-century. Progress was slow, of course, but it is undeniable; the changes in the Academy of the 1980s noted by Sherwood are a clear example.[12] Indeed, the problems Sherwood identifies almost certainly stemmed from larger society prejudice and the overall condition of race relations in America; and eliminating those problems (and treating Black Midshipmen more fairly) resulted in improvement across the board.

Sherwood's conclusion—that "[t]he historical record makes clear that a lack of diversity leads to racial unrest"[13]—misses the point that racial prejudices in the larger society led to inequalities, which resulted in the tensions that led to unrest. Fix the larger societal problem and you solve the military problem, as illuminated by Sherwood's discussion of conditions for minorities at the U.S. Naval Academy since 1980.

Bailey. Bailey's report closely parallels Sherwood's, makes largely the same argument(s), and contains the same fundamental errors. Notably, however, Bailey makes

---

[11] Dkt. 46-7, ¶67; *id.* ¶73.
[12] Dkt. 46-7, ¶64 and ¶65.
[13] Dkt. 46-7, ¶76.

13

the following observation: "The soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen who fill the en-listed ranks are drawn from civilian society. No matter how well they are trained, they are still products of their upbringing, and today they remain in closer touch with civilian society than at any point in the past. The suspicions and divisions that characterize civilian society do not automatically disappear when someone dons a uniform, just as Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor observed in 1969."[14]

Apparently without recognizing the influence this statement should have on her analysis, Bailey gets to the heart of the matter: the military services did not act inde-pendent of society. Though wrong, their internal behavior reflected what was going on outside of their purview. Again, this isn't to say that discriminatory practices within the military should be excused, but they should be placed in context, as a reality of their time and condemned with the same context, not independent of it.

Indeed, Bailey appears to recognize this when she credits "changes in U.S. society and the move to an all-volunteer force" as "help[ing] to resolve the major racial tensions most laid bare in the Vietnam era."[15] The military is an extension of the society from which it draws its people. When overt racial discrimination and hostility existed in larger society, it isn't surprising that racial problems existed within the military. And as society got better, it isn't surprising that the military got better at dealing with injustices, unfair practices, poisonous attitudes, unhealthy tensions, and the rest.

---

[14] Bailey Report, 41.
[15] Bailey Report, 3.

III.   The Academy's other experts all rely on conclusory and unsupported assertions about diversity and military effectiveness.

Haynie, Lyall, and Truesdale all purport to show how diversity—and racial diversity in particular—improves military readiness. All three assume the premise of their arguments and fail to provide any evidence tying the racial makeup of military units to performance outcomes.

Lyall. Lyall analyzes data on "racial and ethnic division in the ranks of nearly 300 armies in 250 conventional wars between 1800 and 2011" to assess "how well these militaries performed in battle."[16] His conclusion: the militaries that sustained high levels of inequality performed worse than those that were more inclusive and featured less instances of widespread prejudice, race/ethnic-centered abuse, and better leadership.[17]

Like Sherwood and Bailey, Lyall's research indicates that good leadership, fair treatment, unrestricted access to opportunity, unbiased recognition and reward, and promotion and representation throughout the ranks based on merit result in military forces that are more cohesive, reliable, and effective. In other words, military forces that demand good leaders who don't abuse their troops perform better than forces that treat people differently based on their racial/ethnic identity. But this should lead to the

---

[16] Lyall, p. 8.
[17] Lyall, pp. 9-12.

15

CONFIDENTIAL

question of whether the current U.S. military discriminates, excludes, and treats its people unequally.[18]

On page 5, Lyall cites various militaries of antiquity—the Romans, Carthaginians, Persians, and Mongols, noting their effective incorporation of diverse forces to advantage on the battlefield. But the story is more complicated than that. The rulers controlling those forces realized it was far easier to coopt them in partnerships, to compel them to serve (having conquered them), or to leverage them as additive forces (renting them as mercenaries) within a larger army though maintaining their own character— options far easier than converting them into "Roman" soldiers (or their equivalents in other armies) and engaging in inclusive exercises such that each component understood and appreciated the other.[19] In contrast, the U.S. military draws its volunteers from

---

[18] Of course, unfairness and poor treatment exist in racially/ethnically homogenous forces, too. A member of a group with the same race, ethnicity, or religious identity can still not fit in for many reasons. People can be just as mean to someone of their own demographic group as they can be to someone of a different group. Elevating racial identity and then compelling everyone to embrace the differences in their uniqueness is no guarantee of enhanced team identity and cohesion.

[19] The literature on this is quite extensive, but a few examples should suffice to counter Lyall. It is true that the Romans (and others) leveraged the manpower and skills of foreign forces, but not in a way or for reasons that align with Lyall's claims or the overall argument for the value of diversity made by the Academy. The famed British military historian Sir John Keegan has had a lot to say on the matter. Drawing from one of his works, *A History of Warfare*, he addresses Rome's use of various Germanic barbarian tribes, generally referred to as *foederati*, on pages 185-186. So, too, has Lucas McMahon in his thesis, *The Foederati, the Phoideratoi, and the Symmachoi of the Late Antique East (ca. A.D. 400-650)*. As the Roman empire expanded, Rome's emperors and generals increasingly needed more men to guard the frontiers. In addition to their raw numbers in men, the barbarians brought skills on horseback, contributing to the rise of cavalry and the slow decline of heavy infantry. Rome made use of various enticements to gain needed manpower, to include the promise of citizenship and various types of pay. (McMahon, p. 9) Keegan also notes Rome's skill in opportunism, recounting how it turned a defeat in Greece, at the hands of the Visigoths in 378 A.D., into a type of alliance whereby the Visigoths settled in their captured territory with the promise to assist Rome in its wars. (Keegan, pp. 185-186) McMahon also described the rise of such relationships but also clarified that *foederati*

16

America's citizenry—both society and the military having made great strides to put race-based matters behind them—and molds them into a force with a common identity: Marine, sailor, soldier, airman, focused on common tasks, and held to common standards. Given the vast differences between the two—today's U.S. military and the militaries mentioned by Lyall—I struggle to see the applicability of such historical examples other than to emphasize the importance of leadership and fair, equal treatment of everyone serving in uniform. The level of "diversity" within the force seems to be irrelevant as it pertains to effective combat power.

---

would fight alongside Roman units but under their own leaders. (McMahon, pp. 10-11) He goes on to explain that this separate-but-useful arrangement came in handy when troops would do something horrible to the locals. Rome would blame the barbarians rather than have the blame fall on Roman soldiers. (McMahon, pp. 39-40)

Keegan continues: Muslim caliphs had a similar problem populating their armies as their conquests expanded. They "made a virtue of the expedient of arming slaves for warfare and to use state revenue to buy recruits to *[sic]* slave armies." (pp. 197-198) Genghis Khan did something similar though he shifted to a merit-based system for a small number of people while still retaining the general practice of seeking arrangements with large numbers of foreign troops. But even in these instances he insisted on imposing Mongol tribal customs on troops more closely tied to his own. Keegan makes no mention of the Mongols cherishing diversity whereby they embraced the differences of their partners in an idealistic sense. (pp. 204-205) In pages that follow (pp. 221-234), Keegan provides an overview of the evolution of armies, the how and why of adopting different forms and composition as responses to the changing character of war and weapons and tactics rose and fell. When possible, armies would almost always consist of home troops. As territory was seized and peoples conquered, the need for more forces led to the use of mercenaries and to conscription. It was the necessity of war and economic viability that led to multi-ethnic forces. War has a logic of its own that forces kings and armies to do what must be done, far different than pursuing an idealism where individual identities were prized so as to maximize the potential of a society and its military. See John Keegan, *A History of Warfare*, Pimlico (Random House), 1994, and Lucas Mc Mahon, *The Foederati, the Phoideratoi, and the Symmachoi of the Late Antique East (ca. A.D. 400-650)*, University of Ottawa, April 2014, https://www.academia.edu/15110353.

The British did much the same thing in governing India, using local authorities to carry out the daily duties of governance rather than importing thousands of British bureaucrats or requiring Indian officials to become proper Englishman. So long as they carried out the sovereign's wishes, it didn't matter what their local customs were.

In pages 9-12, Lyall explains the problems that arise from inequality, including: "[undercutting] soldier beliefs that all groups share the same battlefield fate"; "[reinforcing] existing grievances against the regime" [i.e., the governing power]; corrosion of "interracial and interethnic bonds and trust"; and strengthening of "intra-racial and intra-ethnic bonds, making it easier for targeted groups to organize collective action designed to subvert military authorities." Lyall adds, on page 13, that "military inequality forces militaries to adopt inefficient policies designed to monitor and suppress their own forces to prevent poorly motivated soldiers from fleeing and shirking." Lyall's apparent answer to these problems is for the services to more explicitly acknowledge the racial and ethnic identities of minority communities and to enact policies whereby majority elements (usually meaning white) somehow craft a unified whole that still maintains and emphasizes the unique identities of minority groups as a precursor to obtaining a coherent and effective whole. But as I have previously explained, promoting individual identities as a higher priority than the unit's identity will only serve as a barrier to achieving a true commonly held identity. In addition, in my experience, good leadership, positive values, equitable treatment regardless of race or other subgroup/individual identity, fairness in reward and discipline, adherence to clearly defined standards, and focus on mission are the medicine for the ills presented in his report.

On pages 23-25, Lyall attempts to draw insights from "contexts analogous to modern combat" wherein "diversity and inclusion can affect [the] mission performance" of the U.S. military. He presents various examples from peacekeeping

18

CONFIDENTIAL

operations, civilian policing, and counterinsurgency operations. Each has its shortfalls

in serving up insights relevant to the primary mission of the U.S. military: prevailing in

combat.

Peacekeeping operations are extraordinarily sensitive to their starting conditions,

meaning the events and actors that created a situation that led to the use of peacekeep-

ing forces in the first place.[20] Such forces are not inserted into an active conflict, so their

use presumes some meaningful level of willingness among the warring parties to call a

halt to the fighting. Once that condition has been reached, the countries that contribute

forces go through a rather complicated series of domestic political discussions to deter-

mine whether their own interests will be served in participating. Sometimes, the country

that provides forces does so because of the funding involved; far better for someone

else to pay for its troops than to pay for them out of its own budget.[21] There can also

be foreign policy and trade interests as drivers; some countries want to be involved

because they see a long term benefit that can result in closer relations with the U.S.,

securing defense contracts, benefitting from foreign aid, or closing a trade deal.[22] The

---

[20] United Nations Peacekeeping, "Principles of Peacekeeping," United Nations, https://peace-keeping.un.org/en/principles-of-peacekeeping. These principles include consent of the parties, im-partiality, and non-use of force except in self-defence and defence of the mandate.

[21] Dennis Jett, "Why Peacekeeping Fails," The Foreign Service Journal, May 2019, https://afsa.org/why-peacekeeping-fails.

[22] The UN's peacekeeping agency provides a great deal of information on its ongoing opera-tions and the countries that make them possible. What it does not provide is insight into the reasons countries provide forces, including military, police, specialists, and administrators, and why they agree to support specific missions. Such discussions are kept private unless revealed in off-the-record con-versations or in articles or memoirs written by those with direct knowledge (published after the fact).

point here is that Lyall's assertion that the diversity of a peacekeeping force is a key

factor in its success is simplistic.

The same holds for his use of civilian policing and the role of racial or ethnic

composition of the police force. How closely a police officer identifies with their com-

munity, and their community with them, would be relevant to only a very small subset

of military tasks. This is especially true for the U.S. Navy, whose sailors may interact

with local populations during port calls, arranged only in times and places where the

United States has good relations with the host country to begin with. There are some

occasions when Navy personnel will go ashore to provide social services that include

medical and dental care for local populations in dire need of such, but even here this

can raise tensions, or be politically embarrassing, because it reveals the government is

unable to provide for its people. Once again, there is more to the story of the context

---

Appendix A provides a listing of the top ten countries providing forces in 2024 and the eleven peace-keeping missions being conducted. This information can also be found at United Nations Peacekeeping, "Troops and Police Contributors," United Nations, https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/troop-and-police-contributors and https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/02_country_ranking_75_june_2024.pdf. Ongoing peacekeeping operations are presented here: "Where We Operate," https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/where-we-operate. While Lyall argues that the diversity of the peace-keeping forces contributes to the success of the mission, it seems a stretch to believe that such small contingents of forces, drawn from countries profoundly dissimilar to the countries to which they are deployed (language, culture, beliefs, religions), and usually operating along a very narrow stretch of border or boundary in countries so much larger in scale and population, would be able to connect with the local population in meaningful ways or shape the trajectory of a crisis. I agree that they can be useful as an independent reporting agency to help keep everyone honest, but this is a far cry from making the case that the racial composition of U.S. military forces is essential to the combat effective-ness or ability to establish relationships with local populations caught up in a crisis of such severity that the U.S. military was ordered to intervene.

in which U.S. military personnel engage with foreign populations and the racial composition of the force has no relevance to mission success.

As with Sherwood, Lyall offers a narrative that is mostly irrelevant to the realities of the current U.S. military. Throughout, Lyall references historical cases where brutal disciplinary measures, systemic discrimination, treatment of disfavored groups as second-class citizens, and so forth resulted in problems. No kidding. It should be self-evident that when you treat people badly, you will have problems. No organization will function effectively; resistance will arise; abused groups will work to escape oppressive conditions; and critical efforts will collapse under the weight of injustice, corrupt practices, toxic leaders, and systems that offer little hope that conditions will improve. Hence the extraordinary efforts that have been made by the U.S. military—and by American society in general—to abolish the vestiges of slavery, racism, religious prejudices, and all the many things that turn people against each other.

Haynie. Haynie's report begins with a fundamental error in logic. She assumes that because people are "the most important aspect of organizations, including the military," and that because "war and warfighting are fundamentally human endeavors,"[23] the military must therefore make accommodations for each and every individual person who wishes to serve, as if success in war depends on ensuring that individual identities and personal preferences are placed first in the list of things a military must do to be

---

[23] Haynie, p. 2.

effective in combat. The reality is much the opposite. Military forces are effective when their individual elements—the people that comprise them—largely subordinate their personal identities in deference to that of the team, service, force, and country they are serving.

British historian Richard Holmes had a great deal to say about this in his book *Acts of War: The Behavior of Men in Battle*,[24] but he begins with some commentary on the variety of efforts that have been made to understand why people (almost always men) react to war the way they do and the strengths and shortfalls of those who undertake the task from various disciplines. Historians tend to lead the way, but sociologists and academics of kindred spirit have had their go at it, too. Here is Holmes' view:

> "The study of battle experience by analysts who use the tools of sociology can also come close to the truth. A great deal of valuable work has been carried out by military sociologists—if one can use that term not unfairly. Specifically, examination of the role of the group in influencing the individual's behaviour on the battlefield, an aspect of analysis upon which a number of sociologists have concentrated, has proved particularly illuminating. Some broader-based studies are of lasting importance: *The American Soldier*, by Samuel Stouffer and his colleagues, is an invaluable source of information on the Second World War GI's attitude to military service and to combat. Yet here also the pitfalls are legion. Sometimes the human element is removed from combat altogether, and we are simply presented with statistics which indicate that 19.8 per cent of soldiers have red hair while only 7.2 per cent are left-handed. It is uncomfortably evident that at least some sociologists lack what C. Wright Mills called 'the sociological imagination'. Their studies are flawed by precisely that tendency which limits the impact of some of the anthologies of battle experience: there is no real attempt to rise above the discipline of the card-index."

---

[24] Richard Holmes, *Acts of War: The Behavior of Men in Battle*, The Free Press, 1989, pp. 11-12.

I sense this in Haynie's contributions, missing the forest for the trees. People *are* at the heart of military forces, but it isn't about the individual. Rather, success in war is about the individual conforming to the group. When they do, they find identity, purpose, and kinship, but also the social pressures and expectations (often unspoken) that demand service and sacrifice that, in turn, breed a level of commitment and loyalty almost never found anywhere else. Military forces that have experienced combat recognize this and this reality is captured in cultural and organizational norms that are rarely understood by outsiders. Holmes writes, "Although the full flowering of group cohesion is to be seen in the regiment, whose corporate identity is often reinforced by distinctive uniforms and insignia, its roots lie deeply in the smallest of military groups" usually numbering no more than ten soldiers.[25] He goes on to say, "it was recognised that the close relationship which sprang up between members of the group had positive advantages in battle."[26] Later, "One soldier summed up his relationship with his buddy with the comment that 'our minds seemed to run together', while another explained: 'A buddy shares everything; if you don't get mail, he lets you read his.'"[27]

Intense combat breeds such intimate connections—as do the long, boring hours and days between action, but war occurs infrequently for military forces so something

---

[25] Holmes, p. 293.

[26] Holmes, p. 294. Holmes notes armies across time have recognized this and have adopted formations to account for such bonding, in addition to tactical advantages based on weapons and tactics. He mentions the Macedonians, Greeks, Spartans, Romans, Prussians, British, Americans, and Chinese.

[27] Holmes, p. 296.

else has to be employed to serve the same purpose between wars: intense training that seems insensitive to the individual, focused as it is on the group, but that has the purpose of strengthening the individual and melding a group. Holmes addresses this closely in his Chapter 2, Mysterious Fraternity: "There is a direct link between the harshness of basic training and the cohesiveness of the group which emerges from it"[28] and "Much of the harshness in recruit training results, then, from the need to cement the group together under adversity."[29]

It is important to note that harsh does not mean cruel, just as fairness does not mean easy. It has been my experience and observation that subjecting people to tough conditions rather than catering to their individual desires helps, rather than hurts, their odds of succeeding in combat when an enemy and the situation into which the force has been deployed has no regard for individual identities. War, enemy forces, and populations that are to be influenced respond to units that are effective. Effective units are created by conformity, discipline, fair and equal treatment regardless of individual characteristics and backgrounds, and an uncompromising demand to meet high standards.

The U.S. Marine Corps is defined by youth from across America doing what it takes to become a Marine, regardless of personal background. In becoming a Marine, joining a team, and effectively serving in a unit, they set aside their identity as white, Black, Protestant, Catholic, etc., and focus, instead, on the "eagle, globe, and anchor"

---

[28] Holmes, p. 47.
[29] Holmes, p. 52.

24

they earned in boot camp and their new title as a U.S. Marine. They are trained to see each other as Marines in order to eliminate factors that would otherwise create barriers or filters to establishing true trusted relationships.

In making her case for the importance of embracing individual identity within the U.S. military, Haynie extends the error by adopting the viewpoint of people *affected* by war rather than the people who are *committed* to war.[30] Yes, national and senior military authorities should want to preclude war by undertaking efforts to avoid war (ideally) or to mitigate tensions that can lead to conflict. This is the realm of diplomacy, economic/trade relations, and public relations. But the primary reason for having military forces in the first place is twofold: to prevent an enemy from imposing his will on you and/or to impose your will on him, either case determined by circumstances leading to the use of force. To the extent military forces deter an adversary or reassure civilians in a crisis situation, they are effective because they are perceived to be effective in combat; they can win in battle. Therefore, combat effectiveness is what matters in considering military forces. Whatever contributes to effectiveness is good; whatever detracts from it is bad. Personnel policies based on merit, service to team, standards, and fairness, regardless of personal identity or characteristics, contribute to team cohesion and unit effectiveness in war; they are good. Policies that focus on things that separate people

---

[30] Haynie, pp. 3-4. By "committed," I mean the military force that is directed to engage in war.

from each other, that create barriers and filters, such as privileging racial identity, create obstacles to team building and they degrade unit effectiveness in war; they are bad.

Proof of this is found in practical application, meaning what has been shown to create effective teams across militaries, ages, and wars. As Holmes details and Keegan implies in their respective books (*Acts of War* and *A History of Warfare*), McMahon also captures in the Roman experience within their armies and working with their *foederati*: "Identity is mutable, cognitive, and performative and whether one was a Roman or a barbarian extends beyond loyalty to the emperor or birth in Roman territory. Heavy Roman recruitment from frontier zones contributed to the creation of a common culture in the military. Perhaps most telling of all is the invisibility of ethnic tension in the army during periods of strife."[31] Successful militaries bend people to the regimentation, disciplines, customs and demands of military life, not the other way around. Accounting for individual sensitivities and identities inhibits conformity and setting team before self.[32]

---

[31] McMahon, p. 41.

[32] Holmes and Keegan are just two of countless historians and authors who have captured the essence and experiences of war and the influence these have had on the preparation of soldiers. For greater insight into the conditions of combat, the factors that combine to make effective units, and the importance of emphasizing standards, mission, and team above self and differentiating identities, consider *With the Old Breed*, by Eugene Sledge; *This Kind of War*, by T. R. Fehrenbach; and *The Face of Battle*, another classic by Keegan. Consider also various works of historical fiction wherein the authors drew from their experience or from detailed histories to capture what historians have tried to do in non-fiction accounts. Among them: Stephen Crane's *The Red Badge of Courage* and Michael Shaara's *The Killer Angels*. Lastly, just to show how far back in time the idea of service-before-self was held in the highest regard, consider a small section of Pericles's funeral oration (circa 430 BC), recorded (or embellished) by Thucydides in his *History of the Peloponnesian War* (circa 404 BC), Robert B. Strassler, ed., *The Landmark Thucydides*, The Free Press, 2008, ¶¶ 2.34.8 – 2.46.2.

On page 3, Haynie writes, "Because people are the heart and soul of the military, understanding who people are, what they have experienced, what they see, how they contribute to mission accomplishment, and how the culture around them shapes their full participation is key to developing and leading a dynamic, agile organization." But it is not for the military to adapt itself to every individual; that would be impossible. Rather, the service sets a standard, commits to treating everyone equally and fairly (without preference or prejudice), and challenges people to join a high-performing team. People join the military; the military does not "join" people in all of their glorious variety.

On page 5, Haynie notes that the military has had problems integrating various individuals into teams, citing opposition to "lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender troops and integrating women into combat roles" driven by concerns that their inclusion would lead to a breakdown in team cohesion. This is where standards-based metrics and fair, equitable treatment enforced by leaders, kicks in. It isn't about the individual's personal identity. It is about whether the individual meets standards and whether leadership both enforces those standards and refuses to condone abusive treatment within a unit. What warps the system and generates resentment—and through it, a loss of unit cohesion—is manipulation of standards to force a desired result, often a specific representation within military ranks of some element of society to satisfy a political objective.

27

Admirably, Haynie raises "*task* cohesion" as a "stronger predictor of team performance" than social cohesion.[33] This comports with my own experience and that of innumerable colleagues. Given that military units are populated by people of so many different backgrounds, it is impossible to develop socially based connections that are linked to shared or similar experiences from prior to military service. What does link people are shared adversities and shared adventures. Tough times, like those experienced in contingency environments (and, for that matter, basic training) force people to see beyond surface differences to rely on what any member of the team is bringing to the team. Good times—shared liberty in a foreign port, time carousing around the barracks or base, or working together to succeed in a difficult training event—create a different sort of bond that also connects people regardless of individual identity. All of these experiences, whether forced by the intensity of war or enabled by comradery enjoyed as a team, are in the "task cohesion" world. This is quite different from the bonds presumed to exist because of commonality in race or ethnicity. I therefore find it curious that Haynie goes on to make the case that race and other individual-based identities must somehow be accounted for to realize effective team coherence.

Haynie's focus on secondary and peripheral matters, relative to the combat competency of military forces, continues in pages 6 through 9 wherein she raises a series of "benefits" to be obtained by pursuing diversity as a force-multiplier. On pages 6, 8, and

---

[33] Haynie, p. 5.

CONFIDENTIAL

9, Haynie makes the case that the officer corps, to which Naval Academy graduates flow, benefits from having people from a diverse array of backgrounds for a number of reasons that include: "greater cognitive heterogeneity," innovative and critical thinking, and better-informed decision-making that presumably leads to greater effectiveness and mission accomplishment. Further, she asserts that diversity is critical to debate at senior levels that results in more informed decisions. She then implies that a cadre of mostly white officers is limited in its ability to lead and to make good military decisions compared to a group of minority officers (presumably on land, at sea, and in the air). This is an insult to generations of officers who have led U.S. forces to success in combat actions for nearly 250 years, and it implies that minority officers will make better decisions simply as a function of their race. I am not aware of any battle-studies analyses that hold this to be true, and I have studied (or experienced) wars, campaigns, major operations, and tactical engagements for forty-plus years. From what I have observed and studied, military leaders are either competent in their duties and good stewards of their commands or they are not, regardless of race.

I am highly skeptical of Haynie's argument (and that of her references, like LTG Stanley McChrystal) that a more racially diverse U.S. force would have been better equipped to deal with the local populations of various countries, like Iraq and Afghanistan, in which the U.S. conducted combat operations for 8 and nearly 20 years, respectively. As I mentioned earlier, the primary job of U.S. military units is to be expert in combat. But setting those occasions aside, when U.S. forces are deployed to locales to

29

support "security operations," the circumstances that led to their deployment invariably mean that local groups have been at odds with each other (otherwise no need for a U.S. intervention). Tensions are high and each side has their own story to tell. With rare exceptions, it is impossible for a U.S. unit to know with any certainty who is telling the truth or who is spinning their story to U.S. forces to coopt U.S. capabilities in a way that gives one local group an advantage over another. There is such a profound difference in cultural perspective, values systems, power structures, religious beliefs, "tribal history," and so forth that expecting any individual Marine or sailor to divine truth or to accurately relate to a local population is far-fetched. This isn't to say that American forces should dispense with efforts to gain the cooperation of locals; the "law of conservation of enemies" applies—don't make any more than you have to. But to think that just because a percentage of the force includes Hispanics or Asians, it will work more effectively with Kenyans, Cambodians, Croatians, or Peruvians is an unreasonable stretch. The base of the argument is that a force with diversity learns to deal with different peoples more effectively, but in practice the gulf between Americans and nearly every other people is so great as to make racial diversity in a U.S. force a meaningless factor.

When a crisis erupts and U.S. forces deploy to it, their experience is more "adventure tourism" than deeply committed cultural study. American units rotate every six to twelve months. When they arrive, it takes a month to get oriented. U.S. troops are routinely restricted from routine interaction with locals, especially when security

30

CONFIDENTIAL

concerns abound. The last month of the unit's tour is usually focused on wrapping up

their involvement, packing up gear, and readying for handoff to the replacing unit, at

which time the cycle repeats. There is very little time, and very little chance, that pur-

ported strengths in diversity will translate into meaningfully improved relations with

local populations. Rather, the best approach by U.S. forces is to do as little harm as

possible, meaning to avoid abuses, avoid taking sides in political/cultural/religious

spats, avoid inserting themselves too deeply into local politics, and observing rules of

engagement. The locals will see U.S. units come and go over whatever duration the

crisis exists and seldom develop any attachments that result in deeply rooted trusting

relationships.[34]

---

[34] For discussions of military (primarily U.S. Army) unit rotation policies and their effect—explicit and implied—see: John Spencer, "How to rethink the U.S. military's troop deployment policy," Politico, June 27, 2016, https://www.politico.com/agenda/story/2016/07/rethinking-us-military-troop-deployment-policy-000177/; J. Michael Polich, Bruce R. Orvis, and W. Michael Hix, "Small Deployments, Big Problems," RAND Arroyo Center Issue Paper, 2000, https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/tr/pdf/ADA429427.pdf; and John F. Sopko, *Afghanistan Reconstruction: Lessons from the Long War*, National Defense University Press Prism Vol 8, No. 2, Oct. 4, 2019, https://ndupress.ndu.edu/Media/News/News-Article-View/Article/1980479/afghanistan-reconstruction-lessons-from-the-long-war/. For confirmation of service rotation tour length policies in Iraq, see JoAnne O'Bryant and Michael Waterhouse, *U.S. Forces in Iraq*, Congressional Research Service Report for Congress RS22449, May 8, 2008, p. 6, https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/tr/pdf/ADA483909.pdf. I recall from personal conversations with a colleague serving in the Current Operations Branch, Headquarters Marine Corps at that time that there was a dispute between the Corps and the Army over the length of tour for deployed units. The Army insisted that one year to 15 months was needed for forces to really get a feel for the situation and to maximize such understanding as long as possible. The Marine Corps' argument was based on casualty statistics: after seven months or so, ground units would get so fatigued from the heat, stress, ambushes, IEDs, etc., that complacency would set in and stupid mistakes would increase, leading to a loss in combat effectiveness and an increase in casualties. The Corps kept its units in theater no longer than seven months.

There is even less opportunity for the crews of U.S. Navy ships to develop culturally aware relationships with local populations. Port calls last perhaps a week; time ashore for sailors is limited and restricted; direct interactions with partner navies are generally focused on operational interactions handled by the senior officers of the ships involved. I see no relevance to the argument favoring U.S. force diversity as it relates to naval operations.

As for Haynie's use of McChrystal's statement concerning the abuses at Abu Ghraib as incentive for jihadists, it has two major flaws. First, what occurred at the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq, circa 2003, was an abject failure of leadership throughout the command and small unit leader structures of U.S. Army personnel responsible for the care and interrogation of Iraqi prisoners kept there. The actions of those involved in the torture, humiliation, and abusive treatment of prisoners violated every conceivable principle and value one would expect to shape behavior in any unit regardless of

32

composition.[35] Second, those inclined to join groups engaged in jihad[36] are motivated

by many reasons; some include religious zealotry, but others are driven by peer pressure,

salary, fear of local authority figures (join or else), or an opportunity to engage in sanc-

tioned violence. None of these motivations are assuaged by the racial composition of

U.S. forces.[37]

---

[35] The scandal at Abu Ghraib Detention Facility in Iraq involved the U.S. Army's 205th Military Intelligence Brigade. The Article 15 investigation into the 205th MI Brigade also looked at the chain of command extending from the brigade itself, and its internal workings, to the highest levels of the Army. Among the report's conclusions, Lieutenant General Anthony R. Jones, the investigating officer, had this to say, "The leaders from units located at Abu Ghraib or with supervision over Soldiers and units at Abu Ghraib, failed to supervise subordinates or provide direct oversight of this important mission. These leaders failed to properly discipline their Soldiers. These leaders failed to learn from prior mistakes and failed to provide continued mission-specific training. The 205th MI Brigade Commander did not assign a specific subordinate unit to be responsible for interrogations at Abu Ghraib and did not ensure that a Military Intelligence chain of command at Abu Ghraib was established. The absence of effective leadership was a factor in not sooner discovering and taking actions to prevent both the violent/sexual abuse incidents and the misinterpretation/confusion incidents." "Executive Summary Investigation of Intelligence Activities at Abu Ghraib," Department of Defense, 2004, p. 4, https://archive.org/details/DTIC_ADA429125/page/n5/mode/2up. In November 2008, Paul T. Bartone published an excellent overview, *Lessons of Abu Ghraib: Understanding and Preventing Prisoner Abuse in Military Operations*, Defense Horizons, in which he discussed the contributing factors of ambiguity, laissez-faire leadership, and poor discipline, among others that led to the abuses at Abu Ghraib. The racial/ethnic composition of the brigade was never mentioned as a factor in what occurred; it was almost completely accredited to failures in leadership, training, discipline, and clearly stated and enforced standards.

[36] In Islam, jihad is a term used to describe a Muslim's "holy struggle" in his/her dealings with the world, a striving to live according to the tenants of Islam while buffeted by the lures and seductions of the secular world, to live a righteous life. But in this case, jihad means a sort of "holy war", i.e. the use of violence against infidels and infidel powers, like the U.S., to protect Islam, to destroy its enemies, and to extend the reach of Islam across territories and peoples it does not yet control. Those inclined to join jihad against Islam's enemies need(ed) little excuse; if it weren't Abu Ghraib, some other excuse would have sufficed as evidenced by the multitude of jihadists who have joined countless terrorist organizations in many regions for the past half-century or more. To think that a more culturally aware or diverse U.S. military would reduce this threat is ludicrous.

[37] See, for example, Maarten van de Donk, as interviewed by Manasi Gopalakrishnan. "What attracts young people to Jihad?" Deutsche Welles, June 22, 2016, https://www.dw.com/en/why-are-some-people-attracted-to-jihad/a-19348418; Angel Gomez, Mercedes Martinez, et al., *Why People Enter and Embrace Violent Groups*, Frontiers in Psychology, January 7, 2021, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7817893/; Olivier Roy, "What is the driving force

CONFIDENTIAL

As for Haynie's assertion that the racial composition of military units relates to the level of "groupthink" experienced in a unit—racially homogenous units are at greater risk while heterogenous units less so—I have never seen any evidence of this nor does it seem plausible if one has any understanding of military culture.

Regardless of personal background—race, ethnicity, religion, etc.—officers in a unit are subject to "groupthink" that is cultivated by the hierarchical nature of command and related positional power in military units. This is true at all levels, from young lieutenants and ensigns serving with their first units to generals and admirals at senior levels of command and staff assignments. Military organizations do not operate according to democratic principles where everyone is gathered for a group discussion, there is free-play in developing and debating options, then alternatives are put to a vote, signed-off by the commander. I have been in many planning efforts where the senior person in charge stipulated what would be discussed and how, and restricted comment from participants to their specific area of expertise. I have also repeatedly seen commanders or chiefs-of-staff create an atmosphere within their unit (battalion, ship, higher headquarters, etc.) where it was clearly understood that the staff responded to tasks, that the commander had very specific views on issues, and various senior officers or close confidants of whomever was in charge had much more influence on decision-making and

---

behind jihadist terrorism? – A scientific perspective on the causes/circumstances of joining the scene," BKA Autumn Conference 2015, November 2015, https://life.eui.eu/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2015/11/OLIVIER-ROY-what-is-a-radical-islamist.pdf.

implementation/execution than might be expected if one assumed all such interactions were collegial, open-debate forums. This held true regardless of the racial composition of the officer corps. Presuming that the mere presence of minority officers somehow dissipates extraordinarily entrenched factors that are reinforced by organizational structure, military customs and protocols that extend centuries into the past, and the ever-present aspect of "command" (especially aboard U.S. Navy ships) makes a case that is unsupported by any evidence in practical, real-world military affairs of which I am aware, have experienced, and have studied for several decades.

Truesdale. Truesdale's declaration[38] is a series of unsubstantiated assertions, some of them statements from others appointed to high-level positions within the Department of Defense, none of which have any rooting in the practical use of military power in real-world settings, especially against an enemy.

Drawing from her original declaration,[39] to which Defendant's disclosure refers, Truesdale repeatedly claims variations of "[diversity is] one of our greatest strengths,"[40] that "a racially diverse officer corps is necessary for mission execution and maritime dominance,"[41] that a "demographically diverse leadership [cadre] in the Navy and Marine Corps is critical for mission effectiveness and is essential to national security,"[42]

---

[38] Like Sherwood, Truesdale simply incorporates her previous declaration to this Court. See Dkt. 46-4.

[39] Declaration of Lisa M. Truesdale, Document 46-4, Case no. 1:23-cv-02699-RDB, dated December 1, 2023.

[40] Truesdale Decl, p. 4.

[41] Truesdale Decl, p. 4.

[42] Truesdale Decl, p. 6.

CONFIDENTIAL

and that a "force that reflects America [i.e., racially diverse]" results in "the most combat-ready Naval and Marine forces."[43] But she does not provide any evidence to prove these points.

As with Haynie, Truesdale places a great deal of emphasis on people being the priority within the Department of the Navy[44] rather than whether the U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine Corps are combat-effective. These assertions miss the point, for the reasons described above.

Truesdale also serves up, on page 4, a regularly used example of flawed validation for her views and those of others who have written in support of the Defendant's position. She says: "The Department of Defense (DOD) and the DON have made a military judgment that a racially diverse officer corps is necessary for mission execution and maritime dominance." This is not correct. Individual *people*, like the Secretary of Defense or Secretary of the Navy, make such statements, writing them into policies that are authoritative, by definition. When published in a strategy document, like the National Defense Strategy, or as referenced by Truesdale (p. 4) in SECNAV Del Toro's *One Navy-Marine Corps Team: Strategic Guidance from the Secretary of the Navy*, they become the de facto position of the organization. But this is very different than what is implied when saying "the Department has made a military judgment," as if everyone who constitutes the organization is of the same opinion.

---

[43] Truesdale Decl, p. 6.
[44] Truesdale Decl, p. 4.

CONFIDENTIAL

Lastly, as Sherwood did in his reference to Roosevelt,[45] Truesdale invokes President Truman and his Executive Order 9981, "that there shall be equal treatment and opportunity for all persons in the armed services without regard to race, color, religion or national origin."[46] Both Roosevelt and Truman were trying to eliminate barriers to service erected by racial discrimination. They were saying that no one should be denied the opportunity to serve because of personal characteristics like race, creed, ethnicity, religion, etc. Using race to force a desired outcome, as the Academy is doing, is the opposite. By favoring one group, the Academy is denying equal opportunity to another group. By using race as a discriminator to favor a group of applicants, the Academy is perpetuating unequal treatment and is sustaining the view that race is a defining characteristic that people cannot move beyond. This is not only shameful, but counterproductive.

It is hard to reconcile Truesdale's statement that "the military services continue to be one of the most meritocratic organizations in the United States"[47] with her argument that racial identity of applicants to the Academy must receive preferential treatment to offset, presumably, any shortfall in merit. Either merit, the ability to meet or exceed standards, is important or it isn't.

---

[45] Sherwood, p. 14, ¶ 23.
[46] Truesdale Decl, p. 7.
[47] Truesdale Decl, p. 7.

Perhaps tellingly, Truesdale has no operational experience within the U.S. Navy or Marine Corps; at least none has been reported. Her perspective appears to derive from personnel policies developed, directed, and rationalized by political appointees (who have the obligation to implement Administration policy) and senior service officials (who are obligated to follow orders).

Miller and Batterton. Both individuals address statistical analysis of minority representation within the officer ranks of the Navy and Marine Corps. Miller intends to provide testimony that the Navy and Marine Corps must "develop, promote, and retain a diverse pipeline of leaders."[48] But nowhere do they tie this assertion to any notion that a particular racial composition of naval forces materially improves the combat effectiveness of the Navy and Marine Corps. While interesting, a chart that shows changing levels of minority presence in the officer ranks has no relevance in this case unless it is tied to variations in the assessed performance of naval force units and ships.

As is the case with every other expert statement provided by the Academy, assertions that diversity is a strength, that the racial composition of forces improves the combat effectiveness of units, and that a diverse force is essential to the national security interests of the country ring hollow since *none of them* are validated by evidence derived from military operations undertaken by U.S. forces since the founding of the country. None of the Defendant's experts have argued that the outcomes of military operations

---

[48] Miller, p. 3.

spanning the Revolutionary War against Great Britain to recent operations in the Gulf of Aden would have been different had the racial composition of the U.S. military, or its naval services specifically, been different. Nor have the Defendant's experts reconciled their assertions that racial diversity counteracts military protocols and organizational dynamics with the centuries-rooted norms of military forces that prize hierarchical command structures, discipline essential to following orders (regardless of one's view of the order), adherence to standards regardless of one's personal story, and recognition of merit, i.e., performance in battle, training, or garrison duties.

Dated: July 31, 2024   /s/ Dakota L. Wood

                                        Dakota L. Wood, LtCol USMC (Ret)

IV.   Appendix A: UN Peacekeeping Missions - 2024

Uniformed Personnel Contributing Countries by Ranking (Top 10)

1. Nepal
2. Rwanda
3. Bangladesh
4. India
5. Indonesia
6. Pakistan
7. Ghana
8. China
9. Morocco
10. Ethiopia

Source: https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/02_country_rank-
ing_75_june_2024.pdf

Current UN Peacekeeping Missions

1. **MINUSCA – Central Africa Republic**
    a. Tot. force: 22,523
    b. Top 5 country contributors
        i. Rwanda   2148
        ii. Bangladesh 1421
        iii. Pakistan   1317
        iv. Nepal   1241
        v. Egypt   1023
2. **UNMISS – South Sudan**
    a. Tot. force: 18,125
    b. Top 5 country contributors
        i. Rwanda   2625
        ii. India   2402
        iii. Nepal   1737
        iv. Bangladesh 1630
        v. Ethiopia   1512
3. **MONUSCO – Democratic Republic of the Congo**
    a. Tot. force: 17,761
    b. Top 5 country contributors
        i. Pakistan   1908

40

CONFIDENTIAL

  ii. India 1817
  iii. Bangladesh 1676
  iv. Nepal 1153
  v. South Africa 1135

4. **UNIFIL – Lebanon**
 a. Tot. force: 10,541
 b. Top 5 country contributors
  i. Indonesia 1234
  ii. India 895
  iii. Ghana   875
  iv. Nepal 874
  v. Italy 868

5. **UNISFA – Abyei (Sudan**)
 a. Tot. force: 3,473
 b. Top 5 country contributors
  i. Ghana   662
  ii. Pakistan 593
  iii. India 692
  iv. Bangladesh 511
  v. Vietnam 191

6. **UNDOF – Golan**
 a. Tot. force: 1,274
 b. Top 5 country contributors
  i. Nepal 415
  ii. Uruguay 214
  iii. India 200
  iv. Fiji 150
  v. Kazakhstan 139

7. **MINURSO – Western Sahara**
 a. Tot. force: 1,178
 b. Top 5 country contributors
  i. Bangladesh 33
  ii. Egypt 21
  iii. Ghana   14
  iv. Honduras 12
  v. Russia 12

8. **UNFICYP – Cyprus**
 a. Tot. force: 1,026
 b. Top 5 country contributors
  i. Argentina 261
  ii. UK 257

CONFIDENTIAL

        iii. Slovakia   239
        iv. Hungary   11
        v. Serbia   8

9. **UNTSO – Middle East (Jerusalem)**
   a. Tot. force: 998
   b. Top 5 country contributors
      i. Australia   12
      ii. Netherlands 12
      iii. Switzerland 12
      iv. Ireland   11
      v. Norway   11

10. **UNMIK – Kosovo**
    a. Tot. force: 343
    b. Top 5 country contributors
       i. Slovenia   3
       ii. Austria   2
       iii. Finland   2
       iv. Hungary   2
       v. Poland   2

11. **UNMOGIP – India-Pakistan**
    a. Tot. force: 308
    b. Top 5 country contributors
       i. Croatia   8
       ii. Philippines 6
       iii. South Korea 6
       iv. Thailand   5
       v. Argentina   3

Source: https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/where-we-operate

V.   Appendix B: Documents and Materials Considered

In addition to the literature cited in the body of this report and the documents identified in my opening report, I considered the following sources while formulating this rebuttal report:

- Dkt. 46-4 Truesdale Declaration
- Expert Report of Jason Lyall
- Expert Report of Beth Bailey
- Rule 26(a)(2)(c) disclosures of Jeannette Haynie
- Rule 26(a)(2)(c) disclosures of Stephanie Miller
- Rule 26(a)(2)(c) disclosures of Lieutenant Colonel Katherine Batterton
- Rule 26(a)(2)(c) disclosures of John Sherwood
- Rule 26(a)(2)(c) disclosures of Lisa Truesdale
- Transcript of Deposition of Jeannette Haynie
- Jason Lyall, *Divided Armies: Inequality and Battlefield Performance in Modern War* (Princeton University Press, 2020)
- Soeters et. al, *Cultural Diversity in the Armed Forces*
- Almaatouq et. al, *Task complexity moderates group synergy*
- Bouncken et. al, *Multi-Cultural Teams as Sources for Creativity and Innovation*
- Goodwin et. al, *The Science of Teams in the Military*
- Heinecken et. al, *Managing Diversity - From Exclusion to Inclusion and Valuing Difference*
- Hong & Page, *Groups of Diverse Problem Solvers Can Outperform Groups of High-Ability Problem Solvers*
- Li et. al, *A Multilevel Model of Team Cultural Diversity and Creativity- The Role of Climate for Inclusion*
- Pesch et. al, *Effects of Communication Style and Age Diversity in Innovation Teams*
- Salazar et. al, *Diversity and Team Creativity*
- Tshetshema et. al, *A Systematic Literature Review of the Relationship Between Demographic Diversity and Innovation Performance at Team-Level*
- Kraus, et. al, *Exploring Racial, Ethnic, and Gender Disparities in the Military Justice System*

43

Exhibit H

Transcript of Dakota L. Wood

Date: August 13, 2024
Case: Students For Fair Admissions -v- The United States Naval Academy, et al.

WORLDWIDE COURT REPORTING & LITIGATION TECHNOLOGY

1   of that background material was?

2   A.   Well, I listed all of that in my

3   formal statements and in the rebuttal

4   statement. There was more research on the

5   rebuttal because as I read through the other

6   declarations that were provided, you know,

7   what was the truth behind those, and so I

8   would go to either the source materials cited

9   by the person who had written that statement

10   or matters that I was already familiar with,

11   you know, historians that have looked into the

12   nature of armed conflict, or if I needed a

13   statistic, you know, it could be the number of

14   officers that the Naval Academy graduates

15   where ever those statistics are found. So it

16   was that sort of research, but I documented

17   everything in the papers.

18   Q.   Okay. Did you speak with

19   anybody besides counsel about your deposition

20   here today?

21   A.   Not about the deposition, no,

22   but as I detailed in the paper, I did conduct

1 some interviews just to make sure that I

2 wasn't mistaken something in my own

3 recollection of conditions in the navy and the

4 Marine Corps.

5   MR. STRAWBRIDGE: and just to

6 make sure the witness understands the

7 question, I think he's asking you for what you

8 did for the deposition, not necessarily the

9 reports, which I assume you will get to.

10   MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, that would

11 be correct.

12   THE WITNESS: No, I haven't had

13 discussions about the proceedings with anybody

14 on that.

15 BY MR. CARMICHAEL:

16   Q.   Did you meet with counsel to

17 prepare for your deposition?

18   A.   We met yesterday.

19   Q.   Okay. Was that the only day you

20 met?

21   A.   Correct.

22   Q.   Okay. About how long was that?

1   his observation from this particular

2   perspective, but I think the reality is a bit

3   more complicated. You're nuanced what he is

4   conveying here in this particular paragraph.

5   Q.   Do you think that same criticism

6   is a fair criticism of you, that that reality

7   might be a little bit more nuanced and it's

8   not all tactical, that there are other aspects

9   of a -- of how to manage a ship?

10   A.   Absolutely. So I do not ascribe

11   to myself perfect knowledge, right, or I'm the

12   world's greatest leader, which is one of the

13   reasons why I went about interviewing some

14   colleagues who have different experiences,

15   different levels and different settings. And

16   the -- the pitch was, this is my view of a

17   particular issue as it relates to, you know,

18   diversity in the forces and race is a

19   consideration and machine gun teams or

20   whatever that might be, but maybe I'm wrong.

21   You know, maybe I've lived a career path where

22   I haven't been exposed to or I just missed it

1   or whatever it might be, and so getting other

2   opinions on kind of this same issue. And so

3   getting that input was very helpful, you know,

4   perhaps things I hadn't considered or it

5   confirmed, you know, my own particular points

6   of view. So I think if you had a discussion

7   with 100 different people, each individual is

8   going to have a different experience based on

9   their personality, who they worked for and

10   what organization. I mean, even in my own

11   path, I worked in the strategic initiatives

12   group for two years. The group preceding when

13   I arrived and the group -- same group that

14   existed after I left, were completely

15   different entities because the commandants had

16   changed hands. They had different use for the

17   group. They had different directors. Even

18   while I was in the SIG, we started off with

19   one director, Marine colonel, and halfway

20   through he left to take command of a unit, the

21   deputy fleeted up. Still a great guy, but had

22   a different way of going about handling the

1   MR. CARMICHAEL: Could we go off

2   the record to just chat with you about that

3   real quick?

4   MR. STRAWBRIDGE: Sure. Yeah,

5   that's fine.

6   (Off the record.)

7   THE REPORTER: We're back on the

8   record.

9   BY MR. CARMICHAEL:

10   Q.   Okay. Mr. Wood, are these the

11   only three individuals that you're relying on

12   in making your opinions here?

13   A.   That is correct.

14   Q.   What was your methodology in

15   selecting these individuals?

16   A.   They were personally known to

17   me, as I described in the actual statements,

18   you know, Colonel Riley and I were classmates

19   at the school events, as an example. So I had

20   previously worked with and I knew the

21   character of the individual, and I was also

22   aware of their career tracks, you know, what

1   positions or billets they had held. And it

2   seemed to me that they represented a broad

3   swath of experiences in different settings at

4   different points within the Marine Corps.

5   Whether it was recruiting and training,

6   working with general purpose forces, the

7   special operations community, different

8   regions, into Paycom, central command in

9   various levels, right? Either on the drill

10 field, let's say, at the Marine Corps Recruit

11 Depo, both in -- in the actual training

12 recruits, as well as in training the drill

13 instructors that then train the recruits,

14 right? So it's an interesting, you know,

15 different perspectives and then all the way up

16 to the senior levels. For example, Colonel

17 van OpDorp was the chief of staff or the

18 senior military aid to commandant of the

19 Marine Corps or the secretary of the Navy,

20 assistant secretary of defense, acting

21 secretary of defense for a while. Engagement

22 with Congress, which would give some insight

1   into how Congress views the military services

2   and various issues. So it's just the

3   methodology was accessing the experiences and

4   the perspectives of people who had different

5   experiences than I did to make sure that I

6   wasn't so kind of narrowly focused or limited

7   to my understanding of some of these issues.

8   You know, I want to kind of a crosscheck of my

9   own views of these things.

10   Q.   When did Colonel Riley retire?

11 I couldn't quite get that from here.

12   A.   I think I have his actual

13 resume. It didn't include all of it in this

14 report, but I could certainly derive that.

15 When we were at the school advanced

16 warfighting together, so that would have been,

17 as stipulated, in 1999, so let's just round it

18 to 2000, we were both majors, which means we

19 were probably in about -- about the 12 or 13

20 year mark, so if that's the case and we roll

21 forward another 20 years, right, roll

22 backwards. Let's see. I'm trying to do the